THE GOSPEL OF PHILIP

Translated from the Coptic text, with an Introduction and Commentary

By

R. McL. WILSON, B.D., Ph.D.

Lecturer in New Testament Language and Literature
St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews



LONDON

A. R. MOWBRAY & Co. LIMITED

First published in 1962

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LIMITED IN THE CITY OF OXFORD
2344

PREFACE

THE Gospel of Philip belongs to the same collection of Gnostic documents as the more famous Gospel of Thomas, but has not as yet received the same attention. Many of the sayings in Thomas are parallel to, yet not identical with, sayings long familiar from the canonical Gospels, and the suggestion that this document goes back at least in part to a tradition independent of our Gospels at once aroused a lively interest. Philip, on the other hand, has never been considered as anything but a Gnostic document. It is not, however, for that reason unimportant. The original Gnostic documents at our disposal are not so numerous that we can afford to neglect any addition to their number, and this new gospel has in several respects an interest of its own. It provides a striking confirmation for some aspects of the account of Valentinianism supplied by Irenaeus, and to this extent attests the substantial reliability of the early Father's report. If we may date the Greek original, as has been suggested, in the second century, Philip is one of the earliest documents for some of the themes which figure in later apocryphal literature. And by no means least, it is significant for Valentinian exegesis of the New Testament, as evidence of the ways in which the Gnostics took over and adapted New Testament language and ideas for purposes of their own. One or two passages may even have some significance for the textual critic (130. 17: cf. *Matt.* ix. 15; 132. 27f.: cf. *Matt.* xxiii. 38).

The pioneer work on this text was done by Dr. H. M. Schenke, who published the first modern translation in 1959. My indebtedness will be evident on nearly every page, and is frankly acknowledged. The present volume is not, however, merely a reproduction of his work, but an attempt to carry it further and to make some independent contribution to the study of the document. Inevitably there are points of translation and of interpretation on which I have been unable to agree

with him, but criticism on points of detail does not imply any failure to recognize the value of his work, which has laid the foundation upon which all who follow him must build.

My special thanks are due to Dr. W. C. Till for his advice and criticism, but for which this book would have been much the poorer. Dr. Till has himself been engaged on the preparation of an edition of the Coptic text, which is shortly to be published, and over a period of several months we have discussed in detail the problems which the text presents. I think I may venture to claim that in this collaboration the debt has not been wholly upon one side. In any case, the final responsibility for this book, and in particular for the commentary, is my own. For discussion of the language and an index to the vocabulary, reference may be made to Dr. Till's edition. I have also to thank Sir Steven Runciman for drawing my attention to a passage in Obolensky's *The Bogomils*, and for his confirmation of my impression that no exact parallel to 'saying' 91 is as yet known. Finally, I have to thank Messrs. Rascher of Zürich for permission to quote material from the translations of the Jung Codex *Treatise on the Resurrection* (or *Letter to Rheginus*) and *Epistle of James*, which are to be published by them.

R. McL. W.

St. Andrews.
May, 1962.

CONTENTS

THE GOSPEL OF PHILIP

INTRODUCTION

THE discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947 and the succeeding years inaugurated a new era in the study of Christian origins. It is now generally acknowledged that these documents are the remains of the library of a community of Essene type which maintained itself at Qumran down to the Roman occupation of the site about A.D. 68, and which to some extent stood apart from the main stream of Jewish life as we know it from other sources. The texts have shed fresh light on many aspects of the Palestinian background of New Testament times, and the interest which they have aroused is reflected in the steady flow of books and articles devoted to them in recent years.

Even before the discovery of the Scrolls another collection of documents was found at Nag Hammadi in Egypt, the library of a Gnostic group, which may in time prove to be as important for the history of the second Christian century as the Scrolls have been for an earlier period; but their fate so far has been very different.[1] Of the thirteen codices in this collection, one was secured for the Jung Institute in Zürich and the other twelve for the Coptic Museum in Cairo. From the Jung Codex only the Gospel of Truth has yet been published,[2] although work on other texts is in progress. A photographic edition of some of the Cairo texts was published in 1956, and from this German translations were made by Prof. J. Leipoldt and Dr.

[1] On the Nag Hammadi library as a whole see H. C. Puech in *Coptic Studies in Honor of W. E. Crum*, Boston 1950, 91ff.; J. Doresse, *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, London 1960; S. Schulz, *Theol. Rundschau* 26 (1960), 237ff.

[2] Malinine, Puech, Quispel, *Evangelium Veritatis*, Zürich 1956; four pages missing from this edition were published by the same editors, with W. C. Till, in *Evangelium Veritatis* (Supplementum), Zürich and Stuttgart 1961.

H. M. Schenke;[1] but of these only the Gospel of Thomas has so far attracted attention. The discovery by H. C. Puech (and independently by G. Garitte) that this 'gospel' contains a Coptic version of the famous Oxyrhynchus 'Sayings of Jesus',[2] together with the claim (advanced especially by G. Quispel) that this document goes back at least in part to a tradition independent of that contained in our canonical Gospels, made it at once the subject of a lively interest. Translations were published in several languages, and the problems which it presents, including those of interpretation and of its relation to our Gospels, have been discussed in a growing stream of books and articles.[3]

The Gospel of Philip belongs to the same collection, and indeed to the same volume, as the Gospel of Thomas. In Codex III of the Nag Hammadi library (Puech's classification; Codex X in that of Doresse)[4] Thomas is the second text and Philip the third. This may not be without significance in view of the fact that in the Pistis Sophia (c. 42) Philip, Thomas and Matthew are the three disciples charged with the recording of the words and works of Jesus, a charge explained in the following chapter in terms of the three witnesses required by

[1]Photographic edition: P. Labib, *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo*, Cairo 1956. The German translations were originally published in *Theol. Literaturzeitung* 1958–59, and subsequently reprinted, with revisions, in Leipoldt-Schenke, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag-Hamadi*, Hamburg-Bergstedt 1960. This contains the Gospels of Thomas and Philip and the Hypostasis of the Archons (i.e. Labib plates 80–145); the anonymous document which follows them (in Labib, 145–158) is not included (see TLZ 1959, 243ff., and Leipoldt-Schenke 84).

[2] Cf. Schneemelcher, in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *NT Apokryphen i*, Tübingen 1959, 61 note 1; also Puech in the same volume, 199ff.; Garitte, *Le Muséon* 70 (1957), 59ff.

[3] For the earlier literature cf. Wilson, *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, London 1960, to which may be added B. Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas*, London 1961; E. Haenchen, *Die Botschaft des Thomas-Evangeliums*, Berlin 1961; R. Kasser, *L'Evangile selon Thomas*, Neuchâtel 1961; and articles by Haenchen, *Th. R.* 27 (1961), 147ff.; H. W. Montefiore, *New Testament Studies* vii (1961), 220ff.; A. F. J. Klijn, *Vigiliae Christianae* xv (1961), 146ff.

[4] Puech in *Crum Studies*, 101ff.; Doresse, op. cit. 142ff.; for a comparative table of these classifications see van Unnik, *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings*, London 1960, 16f.

Deuteronomy xix. 15.[1] As Puech has shown,[2] there is evidence that at least the Gospels of Thomas and Philip enjoyed a considerable prestige in Gnostic and Manichean circles, and there is reason to believe that some at least of the allusions to writings bearing these titles relate to the documents now restored to us. The one quotation which has come down to us from a 'Gospel of Philip' (in Epiphanius, Pan. 26. 13. 2–3) does not, however, occur in our present Coptic text.[3] As with so many apocryphal gospels, including the Gospel of Thomas, the title of the Gospel of Philip affords no clue to the identity of the author. It is most improbable that Philip had anything to do with it, and the most obvious explanation of its ascription to him is the fact that he is the only disciple mentioned by name in the document.[4]

The Coptic manuscript is probably to be dated about A.D. 400,[5] but the document itself is older. In Puech's view the *Vorlage*, originally in Greek, might be dated to the second century A.D., or at latest to the beginning or middle of the third.[6] Complete certainty is not yet possible, and there is of course nothing to prevent the use of second-century ideas by men of the third century or even later, but there are a number of indications which seem to point to the second century. In the first place there is the agreement with the Valentinian system as described by Irenaeus and in the Excerpta ex Theodoto. It would probably be too much to claim that the document was known to Irenaeus, but it certainly reflects the

[1] Cf. Puech in Hennecke-Schneemelcher 194. Doresse (op. cit. 221ff.) identifies the third 'witness' as Matthias (in this following Zahn); but cf. Puech, op. cit. 227.

[2] For Thomas, cf. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 199ff., esp. 216ff.; for Philip, ib. 194ff.

[3] According to Doresse (op. cit. 225) the passage appears in the Nag Hammadi Gospel of the Egyptians.

[4] Cf. Schenke in Leipoldt-Schenke 34. In an appendix (p. 82) he notes Leipoldt's view that the colophon containing the title is a later addition, which would mean that the document was anonymous down to the transcription of our present text. Comparison with the colophons of Thomas and the Hypostasis of the Archons supports this view, although the similarity of the script may tell against it.

[5] According to Labib, 'the first half of the fourth century A.D.'; but estimates vary considerably. Puech (op. cit. 197) notes that the Ms. was first dated to the middle or first half of the third century, but seems to belong rather to the fourth or fifth. The date 'about 400' is Dr. Till's guess for the Gospel of Thomas in the same codex (*B.J.R.L.* 41 (1959) 451). Doresse (141 and 144) identifies the hand as a book-writing style, the transition to which is said to have taken place during the fourth century.

[6] Hennecke-Schneemelcher 199.

Valentinian theory as he knew it; in Philip the Gnostic system has not yet been dissipated into fantasy as in some other later texts.[1] Secondly, there are the parallels with such writings as those of the Apostolic Fathers. At several points we can see the same or similar ideas, although they are not necessarily used in the same way; nor is it a case of borrowing by Philip from an older text. Here it is important to bear in mind the point recently urged by Prof. W. C. van Unnik,[2] that it is dangerous to treat the Gnostics, the Apologists and others as distinct and separate groups. There are, of course, differences arising from the nature of the documents and the purposes which they were meant to serve—a pastoral letter to a Christian congregation is bound to differ from an *apologia* addressed to the unbeliever—but the Gnostics remained fairly close to the 'orthodox' Church down to about 180; and it is clear from some of their literature at any rate that some at least of them were, or professed to be, Christians. It is indeed an open question how far we can really make use of such terms as 'orthodox' and 'heretical' at this stage, when the situation is still fluid and the issues not yet always clear-cut.[3] Moreover, we must also take into account contemporary trends in philosophy, which in varying degree affected not only orthodox and Gnostics but their pagan neighbours as well. The similarities between Plotinus and Gnosticism neither make Plotinus a Gnostic nor the Gnostics Neo-Platonists![4] In short, we have to distinguish those elements which are specifically Gnostic from those which derive from the common background of thought and ideas and are shared by other groups; and this is one point at which the material supplied by the Nag Hammadi discovery may be of the first importance. In the third place, there is the state of the Canon reflected in the New Testament echoes and allusions. As with the Gospel of Truth,[5] it is clear that for the author of

[1] Cf. Till in *La Parola del Passato*, 1949, 230ff.
[2] *Theol. Zeitschrift* 17 (1961), 166ff.
[3] Cf. H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth*, London 1954.
[4] Cf. J. Zandee, *The Terminology of Plotinus and of some Gnostic Writings*, Ned. Hist.-arch. Inst., Istanbul 1961.
[5] See van Unnik in *The Jung Codex*, ed. F. L. Cross, London 1955, 81ff.

Philip the greater part of our New Testament was known and recognized as authoritative, even if we can scarcely say that it was fully canonical. Here again the evidence appears consistent with a date in the second century. Finally, the general atmosphere seems to be rather that of the second century than of the third. This last factor is admittedly rather more subjective, since it is a matter of the impression formed by the individual scholar on the basis of his knowledge of the period; but the first three points admit of critical testing, and appear to be reasonably sound.

A more delicate question is that of the relative dating of the three Gnostic 'Gospels'. Prof. van Unnik has maintained the thesis that the Gospel of Truth is the work of Valentinus himself, composed about A.D. 140–145 before the development of the specifically Valentinian theories.[1] The editors of the document, however, are more reserved, and claim only that it is Valentinian, while other scholars have denied even this.[2] Others again, like Jonas,[3] admit its Valentinian character but argue that it does not anticipate but rather presupposes the developed Valentinian theory. With the Gospel of Thomas, again, some scholars have argued for a date in the first half of the second century, whereas others have claimed the document to be later than the Diatessaron of Tatian.[4] In both cases it must be admitted that we are far from reaching any agreed conclusion; but if Haenchen and Gärtner are correct in their analysis of the theology of Thomas we should have to allow for a fairly advanced stage of development in Gnostic theory.[5]

[1] loc. cit.

[2] *Evangelium Veritatis* xii–xv; this position is reaffirmed in the supplement (p. vii) The Valentinian origin of the document has been disputed, among others, by Haenchen (*Z.K.G.* 67 (1955), 154) and by Schenke (*Die Herkunft des so-genannten Evangelium Veritatis*, Berlin 1958). [3] *Gnomon* 32 (1960), 327ff., esp. 333.

[4] Puech, for example, would date the last redaction about 140, or perhaps a little later (Hennecke-Schneemelcher 221); dependence on the Diatessaron is suggested by Grant-Freedman, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, London 1960, and by Schippers, *Het Evangelie van Thomas*, Kampen 1960 (cf. the discussion of the relationship there by T. J. Baarda).

[5] Haenchen, *Die Botschaft des Thomas-Evangeliums*; Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas*. But cf. Grobel in *New Testament Studies* viii (1962) 367ff.

The Gospel of Philip, as Schenke has shown,[1] is clearly Valentinian; indeed, a knowledge of some aspects of the Valentinian theory is a necessary presupposition to the understanding of some of the allusions. If, therefore, van Unnik is correct in his view of the Gospel of Truth, Philip must be later. On the other hand, the absence of some of the features which Gärtner and Haenchen have found in Thomas would suggest that Philip is earlier than that work; but it must be said that a first impression on reading the two documents is that Thomas, composed as it is largely of sayings similar to those in our Gospels, is the older, and Philip a later and purely Gnostic compilation on the same lines.[2] This, however, raises the question of the structure and composition of the latter work.

For the present it must suffice to state this problem of the relative dating of these texts and leave it unsolved, for the simple reason that they have not yet been sufficiently studied for a final verdict to be given. The question is, however, important, and will require investigation, since its solution may have much to teach us about the development of Gnostic thought. Moreover, it serves to remind us that these texts are not to be studied in isolation; they must be set in the context of their period, so far as that is possible, and compared not only with other Gnostic documents, whether earlier or later, but with the extant remains of the literature of their times. Only thus will they fully yield up all they have to tell.

Reference has been made above to the New Testament echoes and allusions which this document contains. These range from clear and unmistakable quotations down to echoes which may appear significant to one scholar yet unimportant, or even non-existent, to another. For example, when we read 'Then the slaves will be free, and the captives delivered' are we to think of Luke iv. 18? Or of Romans vii. 23 or Ephesians iv. 8? In many cases we may suspect that some New Testament passage was in the author's mind, although the text scarcely justifies the claim that he is consciously quoting or alluding to

[1] Leipoldt-Schenke 34ff. [2] See further p. 10 below.

our canonical Scriptures. The appended index of echoes and allusions has accordingly been made as complete as possible, with some attempt to indicate the less certain echoes; but it cannot be said that nothing has been overlooked. Of the four Gospels, the author's preference is clearly for Matthew and John, although there is at least one distinct allusion to Luke (126. 7); there does not appear to be any evidence for knowledge of Mark. With the Fourth Gospel may be linked a couple of allusions to 1 John, and there is at least one clear citation of 1 Peter. Among the Pauline letters he knows and quotes from Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Philippians. There appear to be no quotations of Ephesians,[1] Colossians or the Thessalonian epistles, or at any rate they are not such as to be readily detected. The reference to entering within the veil with the high priest (133. 3–5) recalls Hebrews, as Grant[2] observes. This last case may serve at once as an example of the way in which these 'echoes' are frequently employed, and as a warning against any hasty assumption that books not listed above were not known to the author of Philip. Occasionally he does quote, directly and explicitly, but without naming his source or using any formula of citation, but very often the allusions are worked into the context as if he were a man steeped in the Scriptures, to whom their language and phrases came as a natural vehicle for the expression of his ideas.

Structure and Composition

To speak of 'structure' or 'composition' in relation to such a document as the Gospel of Philip may appear at first sight to be a misuse of these terms. Certainly there has been some difference of opinion among scholars upon this subject. Doresse, for example, calls it 'simply an epistle, though without

[1] Unless we are to assume, with Grant, that the imagery of Bride and Groom is inspired by this letter. The idea of 'putting on the living man' (123. 22) may owe something to Eph. iv. 24, Col. iii. 10, the contrast of day and night in 'saying' 126 to 1 Thess. v. 5ff., and the idea of Christ as 'the perfect man' (103. 12) to Eph. iv. 13.

[2] *J.B.L.* 8; *Vig. Chr.* 136 (for details see Bibliography).

stated destination, actually a treatise vaguely directed against some adversaries unnamed';[1] but this, like his further remark that 'the work seems to be written in the name of some "Hebrew Apostles" ', appears to be a first impression based on a somewhat hasty reading (as his book indicates,[2] he had opportunity only for a rapid inspection of some of these texts). Puech says, somewhat more cautiously, 'Apparently we have to do with a continuous discourse, an exposition (or admonition), addressed now to several people, now to an individual'.[3] On the other hand, Schenke calls it 'a kind of *florilegium*', and Segelberg 'a collection of "sayings" without any definite plan of composition'.[4] Finally Grant says it consists 'of materials which seem to be arranged chaotically, if one can speak of chaotic arrangement'; but he goes on to add that despite this lack of order 'both Thomas and Philip are written in order to present very special theological viewpoints'.[5]

On Dr. Schenke's own division, however, some of these 'sayings' are very long. To take but one example, 'saying' 123 runs from 130. 26 to 132. 14—58 lines of text. Admittedly logion 64 of the Gospel of Thomas is also long, but this is a parable and quite unlike anything in Philip; the majority of the sayings in Thomas are considerably shorter. It would therefore seem legitimate to ask whether Schenke's view of Philip has not been influenced by his knowledge of Thomas. Certainly there are 'sayings' in Philip which lend themselves to that description, but it may perhaps be suggested that in some ways the Gospel of Truth would present a better standard of comparison. This rambling and inconsequential method of composition is not without parallel in the writings of the Fathers, or in the Bible itself. Clarity is sometimes introduced by modern chapter divisions, and if the texts were written out as in Philip without these aids to comprehension we should be faced with the same bewildering movement, as of a butterfly flitting from one theme to the next.

[1] op. cit. 222. [2] ib. 120. [3] op. cit. 197f.
[4] Schenke, op. cit. 33; Segelberg, *Numen* vii (1960), 91. [5] *J.B.L.* 2.

This document is certainly an extreme case, but that does not justify us in abandoning the effort to discover how its author (or compiler) went to work. As it is, there are signs at some points of a closer articulation than Schenke would seem to admit, and sometimes, indeed, 'sayings' which he divides appear to belong more closely together. A case in point occurs at 132. 14ff., where Schenke marks the beginning of a new 'saying' at line 21, while Dr. Till would put it at line 23; as suggested in the notes, it may be that the whole passage is more closely connected than appears at first sight. Another example occurs at 128. 5ff., where Dr. Schenke's division separates two questions which might well belong together.

It cannot be contended that Philip is a single coherent text, composed according to normal standards of writing. That any such claim would be erroneous is evident on every page. But why did the 'author' act as he did? Are there any indications to suggest, for example, the fragmentation of an originally more consistent text, or the interpolation of extraneous material? These are questions to which attention must be given in future study. For the present it must suffice once again to state the problem, and to indicate some clues which may help towards its solution. The opening section, for example, appears to present a series of contrasts. Some of them we know from other sources to have been common currency in the vocabulary of Gnosticism, to describe the 'spiritual' Gnostic as compared with the merely 'material' man. Then follows an exposition of the work of Christ (100. 35ff.), interwoven with explanations of man's 'existential' condition. The treatment is not systematic, and there is no clear and logical structure or development; rather does it seem that the link is through association of ideas, or by catchwords. 'Saying' 10, for instance, could be taken as intended to provide a clue to the meaning of the preceding section; 'saying' 11 explains that the names given to things in this world are deceptive, which links with the preceding statement that neither is good good, nor evil evil. This exposition of the truth about names then leads on to a

discussion of the Name in 'saying' 12. On occasion one has the impression that two or three successive 'sayings' are intended as so many separate illustrations of one and the same theme from different angles.

Two further points deserve to be borne in mind in this connection. The first is that the imagery of the bridal chamber, which figures so prominently in the latter half of the work, does not make its appearance until 'saying' 60, almost half-way through; which suggests a certain reserve in relation to this highest 'mystery'. The second is the constant recurrence of a number of favourite themes: Adam and Paradise, creation and begetting, the meaning of the names of Jesus, etc. Taken in conjunction with what has already been observed, these factors may perhaps be held, not unreasonably, to suggest a sort of spiral movement, gradually approaching the central and deepest mystery. That the construction is not entirely random would appear to be indicated by the fact that the document reaches something of a climax towards the end of 'saying' 125, after which the 'Gospel' is quietly rounded off in 'sayings' 126 and 127.

To have to state a problem without being able to supply an answer is of course unsatisfactory, for an author as well as for his readers; but in the present case it seems to be inevitable. It may indeed be a service to draw attention to the fact that there is a problem, since otherwise its existence might be overlooked, and ill-founded conclusions built upon inadequate and ill-considered assumptions. What, for example, is the relationship, if any, between Philip and Thomas? As already noted,[1] a first impression is that Thomas is an adaptation to Gnosticism of sayings largely drawn from Christian tradition, and Philip a later and purely Gnostic compilation on the same lines. Thus Gärtner,[2] noting that it contains none of those sayings of Jesus which are so typical of Thomas, says we must treat Philip 'rather as a compendium of doctrinal passages drawn from Gnostic sources'. On Gärtner's own presentation,

[1] Above, p. 6. [2] op. cit. 30.

however, the thought of Thomas has to be extracted by a process of interpretation, by 'translating' the ideas and the imagery with the help of other documents. In this respect Philip is much less 'esoteric', and the majority of its 'sayings' can be readily understood with no other aids than the New Testament and the account of the Valentinian theory provided by Irenaeus. If Gärtner is correct, therefore, in his interpretation of Thomas, it would appear that the first impression is, in fact, mistaken, and that Philip is the earlier; and this view finds some support in the further fact that a number of the concepts and ideas which appear in this 'Gospel' are employed by perfectly 'orthodox' writers of the second century, including Irenaeus. The problems presented by Thomas have not all as yet been finally resolved, while the study of Philip can scarcely be said to have begun, but clearly the assumption that what is true of the one is also true of the other, merely because there are some rather superficial similarities, may lead to completely false results.

For convenience of reference, and to avoid the confusion consequent on a multiplication of numbering systems, Dr. Schenke's division of the text has been retained. Some such division is in any case necessary to break up the text into manageable units for purposes of comment and discussion.

THE THEOLOGY OF PHILIP

THE author of this document, as already noted, was familiar with several New Testament books, but his theology is scarcely that of the New Testament. Death, for example, is not as for Paul the wages of sin, but the result of the separation of the sexes ('sayings' 71, 78). We do indeed read, in a somewhat obscure passage concerning the trees in Paradise (pl. 122. 1–7), about Adam being slain; but this is not the fruit 'of man's first disobedience', nor is there any reference to forgiveness. The statement that the Law was the tree, and that it could give the knowledge of good and evil but was yet unable to *make* a man good instead of evil, recalls some of Paul's teaching, but it cannot be said that Philip shows any profound grasp or comprehension of Paul's Gospel. It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that his discussion of the resurrection of the flesh (23), if the interpretation suggested in the notes is correct, reflects so accurately the Pauline doctrine. There is a reference to redemption (9), but it is not developed. There is no theory of the Atonement, and none of the refer-sences to the Cross suggests that it has any saving significance. In short, it must be said that the document gives the impression of being the work of one who knows the language without having penetrated very deeply into the content of Christian thought. In this, however, he was perhaps a man of his time. The proper standard of comparison is not the theology of the Reformation, or of the later Fathers, much less any theology of to-day. It is the theology of the second century. Now it appears from other sources that Paul's teaching went into something of an eclipse in the post-apostolic period, and it is only with Irenaeus that a genuinely Biblical theology really begins to emerge.[1] If Philip does indeed belong to the second

[1] Cf. for the Apostolic Fathers Torrance, *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*, Edinburgh 1948, and Lawson, *A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers*, New York 1961; and for Irenaeus Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of St. Irenaeus*, London 1948.

century, as has been suggested above, then no small part of its importance may lie precisely in the fact that it enables us to see a man of that period grappling, however inadequately, with the problems of Christian life and thought.

That he counts himself a Christian is clear: he can contrast his present state, and that of his readers, with the period before they became Christians (6, 102); he draws a distinction between Christians and the nations of this world (49), and he can distinguish the reality from the name (59). Indeed, he goes further, to speak of being not merely a Christian, but a Christ (67, cf. 44)). The derivation of the name 'Christian' from the chrism (95) he shares with other writers of the period, while his condemnations of idolatry and sacrifice also have their parallels. In 'saying' 95 he develops his own theory of 'apostolic succession': 'the Father anointed the Son, the Son anointed the Apostles, and the Apostles anointed us'.

It is in keeping with this that he gives to Jesus a prominent place, even if it is not exactly the place that is given him in the New Testament. Dr. Schenke[1] lists twenty-seven sayings which refer to Jesus, to Christ, or to the Lord, and another six at least may be added, not to mention those which refer to the Son or to the Son of Man. Christ is the perfect Man (15), whom the Gnostic must put on (101). He came 'to redeem some, to save others, to deliver others' (9), or as it is put elsewhere 'to make good the separation' (78). At several points he is contrasted with Adam (e.g. 83). 'Saying' 72 presents a kind of inverted Docetism: the flesh we mortals possess is not true flesh (and therefore, as 23 says, cannot inherit the kingdom of God), but only a likeness of the true, which is that of Jesus. If Philip can echo the New Testament when he speaks of 'bread from heaven' (15), his speculations on the flesh, and on the names of Jesus, lead him away from the New Testament doctrine. His Christ comes not to save the world by giving his life but to restore things to their proper places (70) and become the father of a redeemed progeny (74, 120).

[1] Leipoldt-Schenke 33.

Deliverance comes through knowledge (cf. 110), not through the sacrifice of Calvary.

The same use of New Testament language, transposed into another key, can be seen also at other points. References to the Holy Spirit are common enough, but it is difficult to be certain which of them refer to the Holy Spirit of Christian theology, and which to the Gnostic Sophia-Achamoth, who as we know from Irenaeus was also called 'Holy Spirit'. The three 'theological virtues' of 1 Corinthians xiii are mentioned, but unfortunately in one case, referring to faith and love (45), the text is damaged; another (115) makes reference not only to faith, hope and love, but also to *gnosis*; and it is not by faith in Christ that a man finds life, but by 'believing in the truth' (100. 17). Of the references to the Resurrection, two (21, 90) present the view condemned in the Pastoral Epistles, that for the believer it is already a thing of the past. Another admittedly, as already noted, is an accurate reflection of the Pauline doctrine (23), but admits of interpretation in a Gnostic sense. Of the others, 67 contains no more than a passing allusion, while 63 treats the resurrection as one of the three possibilities open to man: he may find himself either in this world or in the resurrection or in 'the places of the Midst'.

This world is unreal, and the names that are here employed are deceptive (10–11, 63); it came into being through a transgression (99). The only true realities are those of 'the other aeon'. In this world man is under the sway of the archons, the hostile powers who seek to bind him to themselves for ever. Here he is exposed to the attacks of unclean spirits (61), and his only escape is to come out of the world into the 'rest' of the other aeon. The same negative attitude appears with regard to the body, and to the flesh (cf. 22, 62, 123). The condemnation of sacrifice (cf. 14, 50) and of idolatry (84-85) may appear closer to more orthodox Christian teaching, but in the light of what has already been said this too is probably to be understood in terms of the unreality of the things of this world.

At this point a note of caution should perhaps be sounded. It is plain from the foregoing survey that we have to do with a Gnostic text—even without taking into account the aspects which have still to be considered. There is, however, a danger here. Nothing is easier than to draw up a schematic outline of belief, be it orthodox, Gnostic or Jewish-Christian, and apply it to the texts, thereafter labelling each with the appropriate designation. But were these three streams so clearly distinct in the earlier stages of Church history? Or should we not rather expect to find a certain interpenetration of thought, a gradual hardening of the lines of cleavage?

So far as Philip is concerned, the document is definitely Gnostic. As will appear, it can be located with confidence as a work deriving from the Valentinian school. This does not mean, however, that it is Gnostic throughout. Much of it in fact could probably have been read without misgiving by many a Christian of the period, and certainly some of the themes appear in other works which have never been considered anything other than orthodox. It may be, therefore, that it will enable us to reach a fuller understanding of the relation between Christianity and Gnosticism, of the ways in which the Gnostics made use of Christian ideas, and of the extent to which they diverged from what was to become 'orthodox' belief. Much of what has come down to us in the pages of the Fathers, or in the extant Gnostic texts which were previously known, has seemed to be merely bizarre and eccentric, yet Gnosticism was enough of a menace for such men as Irenaeus to write at length against it. What was its appeal? And what did these ideas, so strange to us in the light of Christian history, mean for the Gnostics themselves?

Another problem which the Nag Hammadi library may eventually help us to solve is that of the origins of the Gnostic movement. Were the Gnostics, as Burkitt thought,[1] Christians who tried to accommodate the Gospel to the ideas of their time? Or was Gnosticism in fact pre-Christian, a religion in

[1] *Church and Gnosis*, Cambridge 1932, 27f.

its own right which sought to assimilate Christianity into itself, along with other faiths of the ancient world? Was it a Christian heresy, or a form of paganism? Those scholars who claim Gnosticism to be pre-Christian point to the fact that many of the ideas which appear in the Christian Gnosticism of the second century were already current in the period preceding the Christian era, and in this they are certainly correct; but others observe, with no less justice, that we have no clear documentary evidence for anything resembling a Gnostic *system* prior to the Christian era.[1] The problem is complicated by laxity in the use of terms, since some scholars speak of Gnosis in a wide and vaguely-defined sense, as distinct from Gnosticism, while others treat the words almost as synonymous. To add to the possibilities of confusion, the same adjective 'gnostic' has to do duty in both senses. It may be perfectly correct to speak of a Hellenistic *gnosis*, in the wider sense, and *in this sense* to discover 'gnostic' influences in Paul and John; but there is always a danger that some of these influences may first have to be read back from the second century before they can be discovered in the New Testament. The fact that Paul or John uses some conception which was later to become Gnostic does not prove that these writers were exposed to the influence of Gnosticism. On the contrary, some ideas and concepts in second-century Gnosticism are most readily explained, whatever their affinities with other religious systems of antiquity, as the product of a defective exegesis of the New Testament. Here such documents as the Gospel of Philip are of value as showing both similarities with and differences from more 'orthodox' Christian texts, whether in the New Testament or later. Both similarities and differences require to be taken fully into account.

[1] On Gnosticism generally, see Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem*, London 1958; Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion*, Boston 1958; Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, London and New York 1959. Over against a tendency in recent years to seek the origins of Christian Gnosticism in a pre-Christian Jewish gnosis, van Unnik (*Vig. Chr.* xv (1961), 65ff.) emphasizes that we have to do not with one system or one mythology, and therefore must not look for a single origin; moreover the Jewish elements which are certainly present do not necessarily indicate a direct Jewish influence.

According to Doresse,[1] the Nag Hammadi documents provide the evidence for the Christianizing of an earlier non-Christian form of Gnosticism. Indeed, he can classify the texts under the headings of 'The *Revelations* of the great prophets of Gnosticism, from Seth to Zoroaster'; 'Gnostics disguised as Christians'; and 'The Gospels of Christianized Gnosticism'. If this is correct, a problem of long standing will be resolved, but unfortunately the texts are not yet available for detailed examination. Moreover, the position maintained by Burkitt and R. P. Casey[2] has recently been advocated afresh by Mlle Pétrement,[3] who sees the whole Gnostic movement, both in its Christian and in its pagan forms, as the outcome of the impact of Christianity upon the ancient world. So far as Philip is concerned, we can but echo the words of Grant: 'At least in Thomas and Philip we find little reason to regard Gnosticism as a pre-Christian phenomenon. It looks like a special way of viewing materials which are largely Christian in origin.'[4] To the two documents mentioned we should probably add the Gospel of Truth, which likewise weaves together Christian and other elements. The problems, it is clear, are not simple; the answer may not lie along one or another of the lines so far suggested, but rather in some combination of two or more. To reach a final solution we must study these texts not in isolation but in relation to contemporary thought and against the background of their times.

The Sacraments

This aspect of the theology of Philip is sufficiently important to call for separate discussion. It has indeed been the chief

[1] op. cit. 300ff., and for his classification of the texts 146ff.

[2] e.g. in *J.T.S.* xxxvi (1935), 45ff., and in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, 52ff.

[3] *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* lxv (1960), 385ff.

[4] *J.B.L.* 10. Consideration will require to be given in due course to the possibility that the movement was actually from Christian Gnosticism to the Revelations of the 'great prophets', Seth and Zoroaster being enlisted as the Gnostics sought to bring other religions with which they came in contact into their own syncretistic systems. The key document here is probably the Epistle of Eugnostus, still unpublished. According to Doresse and Puech, it was Christianized in the Sophia Jesu Christi; but Till thinks the latter was the original and Eugnostus the adaptation.

concern of two of the three articles devoted to this Gospel: the study by E. Segelberg of the sacramental system as a whole,[1] and the discussion by R. M. Grant of 'the mystery of marriage'.[2] Segelberg takes as his starting point 'saying' 68, which names five rites apparently in ascending order: Baptism, Chrism, Eucharist, Redemption and Bridal Chamber. In 'saying' 60, however, if Dr. Schenke's restoration is correct (and no other word seems possible), the 'mysteries' are seven in number. The explanation of the discrepancy may be either that there were other sacraments also, or that the 'mysteries' refer to something else. Of the five mentioned, the Eucharist and the Redemption do not figure very prominently. For the former we may refer only to the words about the 'bread from heaven' (15, cf. 23) or 'the bread, the cup and the oil' (98) or 'the cup of prayer' (100). 'Bread' and 'the cup' are mentioned also in 108, while in 53 Jesus is identified with the Eucharist. In none of these is there any indication as to what form this sacrament took. In 26 the word is used in the sense of 'thanksgiving.' The Redemption was a rite practised by the Marcosians (Iren. i. 21), but does not figure at all prominently in Philip. In 76 it is apparently linked with Baptism, but perhaps we must distinguish redemption as an act of deliverance from the sacrament known as the Redemption. If Segelberg is correct, the 'oil' of 98 has nothing to do with the Eucharist, but is to be linked with the *apolytrosis*; he compares the latter with the *euchelaion* of the Byzantine Church. On these two sacraments, then, the text affords but little information. Perhaps the most striking feature is that in 100 the drinking of the cup is the means of receiving the perfect man, which in 101 appears to be linked with Baptism; but in 108 the 'holy man' is so holy as to sanctify even the bread and the cup.

The three remaining rites have a somewhat more prominent place, and indeed it might be argued from 'saying' 76 that at some stage there were three sacraments only, corresponding to

[1] *Numen* vii (1960), 189ff. [2] *Vig. Chr.* xv (1961), 129ff.

the three 'houses' in the Temple at Jerusalem. From the references to 'going down to the water' (59, 101, 109; cf. 120. 30), Baptism would seem to have been by immersion, probably in a river but possibly in some kind of reservoir or cistern. 'Saying' 101 indicates that the candidate laid aside his clothes before entering the water, and we may presume that he put on fresh garments on emerging, as in other forms of the baptismal rite. To this, as Segelberg observes, a symbolic significance was attached. An interesting point emerges from 59, in that the 'true' believer is expected to receive the Holy Spirit at Baptism, not at Confirmation; he who has not received the Spirit has merely taken the name of Christian 'on loan', whereas he who has received the Spirit possesses the name in reality, as a gift that will not be taken from him. 'Saying' 43 suggests that Baptism conveys a *character indelibilis*.

In the light of these sayings we may reasonably conclude that Baptism is in view, or at least in the background, in other 'sayings' which refer simply to water (e.g. 24, 25). Some of them, however, refer to Baptism not only in water but in light (e.g. 75), and the latter is identified with the chrism. Moreover a certain disparagement of Baptism appears in 90, which seems to imply that some people speak of Baptism as 'a great thing', which it is not; and in 95, which states clearly and unambiguously that the chrism is superior to Baptism.[1] The same appears from 76, if Schenke is right in his restoration of the lacuna at 117. 23. Elsewhere the chrism is identified with fire (e.g. 25). From 92 it appears that olive oil was used for this rite, but no details are given as to what form the ceremony took. 'Saying' 111 is of interest in this connection since it seems to link up with a passage in the Gospel of Truth. Philip speaks of a fragrance enjoyed not only by those who wear the perfume (i.e. the Gnostics) but also by those outside—so long as the Gnostics are with them; in the Gospel of Truth (33. 39ff.) the 'children of the Father' are His fragrance. In 'sayings'

[1] Schenke (op. cit. 37) notes that for the Marcosians Baptism was merely psychic (cf. Iren. i. 21. 2; Hippol. vi. 41. 2–4, 42. 1). Their chief sacrament was the *apolytrosis*, celebrated in various ways—some of which suggest the 'chrism' of our present text.

67 and 74, unfortunately, the meaning of the text is not altogether clear. All we can really say is that the chrism is superior to Baptism, that olive oil was used for the ceremony, and that by an etymology known also to Theophilus the name Christian was itself derived from this rite (95). How far Philip is from distinct and clear-cut ideas on the subject of the sacraments is shown by the fact that in this last 'saying' we are told that he who is anointed possesses all things—and that the Father gave him this *in the bridal chamber* (122. 21–22).

As Grant observes, the imagery of marriage has a Biblical background, both in the Old Testament and in the New. Paul's use of it he thinks most simply explained 'in relation to the Old Testament as interpreted in the light of the work of Christ'. The Gnostic theories show a further stage of development, their ideas being closely related, at least verbally, to the New Testament and their doctrines showing one kind of interpretation which could be placed upon the New Testament data. Since Daniélou has indicated that the imagery of marriage was popular in Jewish-Christian thought,[1] it is possible that it was from such circles that it passed into Gnosticism.

Among the Gnostics it was the Valentinians who made the most of marriage as a 'mystery', and Dr. Schenke had already noted that among other things Philip clearly contains the specifically Valentinian doctrine of the Saviour as the bridegroom of the lower Sophia, and his angels as the bridegrooms of her 'seed' (cf. 106. 11–14 and 'sayings' 61 and 67).[2] This of course provides clear proof of the Valentinian origin of the document, although as Schenke says it may contain elements from other systems also. As already noted, there are some 'sayings' (e.g. 67) which presuppose for their understanding a knowledge of the Valentinian theory.

According to Irenaeus (i. 2. 6) Jesus, also called Saviour,

[1] *Théologie du judéo-christianisme* 326–329.

[2] Among other passages pointing to a Valentinian origin Schenke lists 'sayings' 39 and 125. A 'mystery' of the bridal chamber is attested only for the Marcosians (Iren. i. 21. 3; cf. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme* 315ff.), but may probably be presumed for other Valentinians also. The etymology of 110. 14f. he compares with Iren. loc. cit.

Christ and Logos, is emitted as the perfect fruit of the Pleroma, and with him a bodyguard of angels. Later (i. 4. 5) he is sent to Sophia-Achamoth, who becomes pregnant with a spiritual embryo after the likeness of his guards, and this embryo is secretly inserted into the Demiurge and sown by him in the souls and bodies he has created (i. 5. 6). This embryo is subsequently identified with the 'spiritual' among men, who are destined to become the brides of the angels about the Saviour (i. 7. 1, 5). As Schenke notes,[1] there are variations in the accounts supplied by our several sources, but that in general this is the theory underlying the references in Philip to the bridal chamber is clear enough. The 'bridegroom' is the Saviour, Sophia the 'bride', and the Pleroma is the archetypal bridal chamber. Of this earthly marriage is the counterpart, although it is not always clear whether it is the archetype or the counterpart which is in view, or whether the reference is to marriage as such or to a sacrament called 'the bridal chamber' which was distinct from marriage. Grant notes that according to Irenaeus (i. 6. 3) the rite was not very spiritual,[2] but this may be mere polemic. Bousset,[3] for example, observed on Iren. i. 13. 3 that the reporter no longer understood the meaning of the action recorded, and saw in it only a deception practised by Marcus upon his female converts, while Foerster[4] finds the allegation of libertinism irreconcilable with Ptolemy's views. The fact that a notorious scandal is reported in connection with the mysteries of Isis may suggest that such accusations were not uncommon.[5] On the other hand, it may be said that there is no smoke without a fire, and that the very fact that such charges could be made indicates that they were not

[1] The sources to which he draws attention are Iren. i. 1–8 (on which he refers to Foerster, *Von Valentin zu Heracleon*, Beih. 7 z. ZNW, Giessen 1928, and *N.T.S.* vi (1959), 16ff.); Exc. ex Theod. 43–65 and 29–42; and Hippol. vi. 29–36. Reference may be made in addition to the editions of the Excerpta by Casey and by Sagnard, and to Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de s. Irénée*, Paris 1947.

[2] *Vig. Chr.* 133, referring to Iren. i. 6. 3 (p. 56 Harvey).

[3] *Hauptprobleme* 316.

[4] *N.T.S.* vi (1959), 27.

[5] Josephus, Ant. xviii. 3. 4. The truth of the story has been disputed.

altogether without foundation. It may be, however, that such cases were in fact isolated instances of abuse.

On this point we shall probably never know the truth, but it may be noted that Philip itself provides a basis for such an accusation. Quite apart from the impression conveyed to anyone outside the Gnostic circle by references to a ceremony called 'the bridal chamber', in which apparently both male and female members of the sect took part, there is the statement in 'saying' 31 that the 'perfect' conceive through a kiss and give birth. Misheard, or misunderstood, this statement could in itself give rise to the report. Indeed, we may perhaps go further. As we know from the Apologists,[1] three charges were commonly laid against the Christians in the early centuries: atheism, Thyestean banquets, and promiscuity. The first means simply that Christians did not worship the gods of the official religion, upon whose grace and favour the welfare of the state was held to depend. The second may be explained on the basis of John vi. 53, with its reference to eating the flesh of the Son of Man and drinking his blood, the more particularly if the verse were taken literally by a Gentile who did not recognize the Semitism of the title 'Son of Man'. As to the third, our only line of explanation hitherto has been to assume a misunderstanding of the nature of the *agape* or love-feast. The pagan world, however, did not recognize the finer distinctions between 'orthodox' Christians and Gnostics; all alike were simply Christians, and it is possible that it was the practice of some Gnostic group which brought the slander upon Christians generally.

This cannot, however, be regarded as more than a possibility. As Chadwick notes,[2] Clement of Alexandria blames the Carpocratians, but the slander may be earlier, since the language of Tacitus and the younger Pliny suggests that it was already current by the end of the first century. It may have

[1] e.g. Athenagoras 3. Justin Martyr declares that promiscuous intercourse 'is not one of our mysteries' (1 Apol. 29).

[2] Oulton and Chadwick, *Alexandrian Christianity*, London 1954, 28f., where references are given.

been at the outset one of those false accusations which are so easily spread abroad, and so difficult to refute. But it is worthy of note that Clement speaks of the Valentinians as talking of 'acts of spiritual union'.[1]

In the light of the foregoing discussion, some attempt may now be made to draw together the various threads, and to formulate, however tentatively, an answer to the problems indicated above. The document is clearly Gnostic, and may be broadly identified as deriving from the Valentinian school. Closer identification with one of the branches of that school is more difficult, owing to the nature of our sources, but the affinities of Philip seem to lie with the Marcosians and with the Excerpta ex Theodoto. To identify it finally as Marcosian would be premature, since according to Irenaeus there were differences of opinion on some points among the Marcosians also, and moreover it is not entirely clear what were the innovations introduced by Marcus and others, or how far they adhered to the central tenets of Valentinianism. Generally speaking, the differences appear to relate mainly to points of detail, minor modifications in the myth, for example, or a greater emphasis upon one or other of the ceremonies observed by the group. This would seem to indicate that Philip belongs to a fairly advanced stage in the history of Valentinianism. The development into fantasy has not yet gone so far as in some other documents, but it may be that already some aspects of the system were no longer fully understood even by the author himself. This in turn would mean that Philip must probably be placed later than the Gospel of Truth, whether or not van Unnik is right in identifying that work as from the pen of Valentinus himself. The Gospel of Thomas should perhaps be left out of the reckoning, since it appears to belong to a different Gnostic group (despite some similarities and at least one close contact); certainly the relationship between Thomas and Philip is extremely difficult to assess.

[1] Strom. iii. 4. 29 (trans. in *Alexandrian Christianity* 53). For the Valentinian position cf. Chadwick, op. cit. 30ff.

As to structure and composition, it is impossible to treat Philip as a single coherent document composed according to normal standards. On the other hand, it is also doubtful whether it is rightly described as a collection of 'sayings'. Perhaps the answer here may lie in analysis and comparison with other documents, as in the case of the Excerpta, where Casey, Sagnard and others have been able to isolate blocks of material drawn from the same earlier source: in one case Theodotus himself, as Clement's references indicate, in another the source which lies behind the account given by Irenaeus. In time, perhaps, something of the same kind may be done for Philip, but this lies still in the future.

Two further points may be briefly noted in conclusion. As Grant remarks,[1] both Thomas and Philip 'show us that Gnostics continued to be concerned with Judaism, and with going beyond Judaism'. There is, however, a difference of emphasis between them: Thomas rejects such Jewish observances as prayer, fasting, the giving of alms, and circumcision, even although there are elements which have been claimed to show a Jewish-Christian background; Philip on the other hand, appears to consider Judaism as a stage now past. He and his readers once were Hebrews; now they are Christians. The 'Jewish', or perhaps 'Jewish-Christian', element is possibly stronger in Philip, but it is difficult to avoid the impression that his knowledge of Judaism and of Jewish Christianity was neither very direct nor very profound. If his etymologies are sometimes accurate enough, his references to the three chambers in the Temple (76) or to the friend of the bridegroom and the sons of the bridegroom (122) seem to indicate a certain remoteness from Palestine and from Jewish customs. In Grant's view, there is a movement from Judaism to Christianity to Gnosticism, which recalls Burkitt's description of the Gnostics as Christians who endeavoured 'to set forth the living essence of their Religion in a form uncontaminated by the

[1] *J.B.L.* 10.

Jewish envelope in which they had received it'.[1] Whatever may be said of Gnosticism in general, or of Gnosis, this is certainly the impression left by Philip.

Finally, it must be observed that Gnosticism, for Philip, *was* a religion. Compared with the faith of a Paul it may represent a decline; in the light of Christian history as a whole it may be condemned as false, indeed, a travesty of the truth; but one cannot read the closing lines of 'saying' 125, or 'saying' 127, without a sense that for the author this was a faith in which he found a meaning for life.

[1] *Church and Gnosis* 27f.

THE GOSPEL OF PHILIP

English Translation

THE following translation was made from the photographic edition of the Coptic text published by Dr. Pahor Labib. It has been deliberately kept as literal as possible, at the expense of the literary graces but within the limits of a reasonable consideration for the English language, in order that the reader may be able to see as accurately as may be what the Coptic actually says, and not what the translator thinks it says. Alternative versions, and occasionally a more literary rendering, will be found in the notes.

Dr. Schenke's German version has been carefully compared throughout, and the major variations noted. Reference is also made in the notes to his suggested reconstructions and those of Dr. Till. Dr. Schenke endeavours to make good all the lacunae, but as he says himself the restorations vary greatly in their degree of certainty. In the present version only those supplements for which there is real support in the context have been accepted, and in such cases (especially where only a few letters require to be supplied) brackets have frequently been dispensed with. In other cases conjectures have been admitted to the text in brackets, but these must be regarded as less certain. A critical edition of the Coptic text, with a fresh German translation, is being published by Dr. Till.[1]

In addition, reference has been made at various points to the English versions of certain passages contained in the articles by Grant and Segelberg. These are in general based on Dr. Schenke's German translation, but have on occasion provided an apt English equivalent.

[1] *Das Evangelium des Philippus. Koptischer Text mit Übersetzung und Wörterverzeichnis* (Berlin: de Gruyter). The English version published by C. J. de Catanzaro (*J.T.S.* 13 (1962), 35ff.) appeared after the present work was already complete and ready for the press.

Square brackets indicate restorations, parentheses denote explanatory supplements. Angled brackets have been used to mark emendations. The Greek loan words in the text have not been specially indicated, except where it seemed necessary to an understanding of the meaning.

THE GOSPEL OF PHILIP

NOTE: The translation here given follows the Coptic text line for line and page for page, and number references in the Commentary and elsewhere refer to the pages and lines of the original text.

99 A Hebrew man makes a Hebrew,
and they call him thus:
a proselyte. But a proselyte does not
make a proselyte. [Those who] . . . . the truth
are like . . . .
and they make others . . . .

100 .... wish for them that they may come into being. (2) The [slave] seeks only to be free, but he does not seek after the possessions (οὐσία) of his master. But the son is not only a son, but lays claim to the inheritance (κληρονομία) of the father. (3) Those who inherit (κληρονομεῖν) dead (things) are themselves dead, and they inherit dead (things). Those who inherit what is living are alive, and inherit (both) what is living and the dead. The dead do not inherit anything. For how will the dead (man) inherit? If the dead man inherits what is living he will not die, but the dead will live the more. (4) A Gentile man does not die, for he has never lived that he should die. He who has come to believe in the truth has found life, and this man is in danger of dying, for he is alive since the day Christ came. (5) The world is created, the cities adorned, the dead carried out. (6) When we were Hebrews, we were orphans and had (only) our mother, but when we became Christians we obtained a father and a mother. (7) Those who sow in the winter reap in the summer. The winter is the world, the summer the other aeon. Let us sow in the world, that we may reap in the summer. Because of this it is fitting for us not to pray in the winter. What comes out of the winter is the summer. But if any man reap in winter, he will not reap but pluck out. (8) Like one of this kind he will produce fruit .... not only when he comes out .... but on the Sabbath also .... is without fruit. (9) Christ came

to ransom some, to save others, to redeem others. Those who were strangers he ransomed and made his own. And he separated his own, those whom he set as pledges in his will. Not only when he appeared did he lay down the soul when he wished, but from the day the world came into being he laid down the soul. At the time when he wished, then he came first to take it, since it had been left as a pledge. It was under the robbers and had been taken captive. But he saved it, and those who were good in the world he saved, and the evil. (10) The light and the darkness, life and death, the right and the left, are brothers one to another. It is not possible to separate them from one another. Because of this, neither are the good good, nor the evil evil, nor is life a life, nor death a death. Because of this each one will be resolved into its origin from the beginning. But those who are exalted above the world are indissoluble and eternal. (11) The names which are given to worldly (things) contain a great deception, for they separate their heart from the things which are established to the things which are not established; and he who hears (the word) 'God' does not perceive (*νοεῖν*) him who is established, but he perceives him who is not established. So also with the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and life and light and resurrection and the Church, and all the other names— people do not perceive the things which are established, but they perceive the things which are not established . . . . . they have come to know what is established . . . . . . they are in the world . . . .

102 [If the] . . . . . were in the aeon they would not name any day in the world, nor would they set them among worldly things. They have an end in the aeon. (12) One single name they do not utter in the world, the name which the Father gave to the Son, which is above all things, which is the name of the Father. For the Son would not become Father except he clothe himself with the name of the Father. This name those who have it know (*νοεῖν*) indeed, but they do not speak of it. But those who have it not do not know it. But the truth brought forth names in the world for our sakes, since it is not possible to learn it without names. The truth is one and is many, and (that) for our sakes, to teach us this alone in love through many. (13) The archons wanted to deceive man, since they saw that he had a kinship with those that are truly good. They took the name of those that are good and gave it to those that are not good, in order that by the names they might deceive him and bind them to those that are not good. And after, if they do them a favour, they will be made to remove from those that were not good, and set in those that are good, which they know. For they were wanting to take the free man and make him a slave to themselves for ever. (14) There are powers which give . . . . . to man, without wishing to make him . . . . . in order that they may become . . . . For if the man . . . . sacrifices come into being . . . . and offered up animals

to the powers . . . . [These] are they to whom they offer up. They were indeed offering them while they were alive, but when they offered them they died. As for man, they offered him up to God dead, and he lived. (15) Before Christ came there was no bread in the world, as in paradise, the place where Adam was. There were many trees for food for the beasts, but there was no wheat for food for man. Man used to feed like the beasts, but when Christ came, the perfect man, he brought bread from heaven in order that man might be nourished with the food of man. (16) The archons thought that it was by their own power and will that they were doing what they did, but the Holy Spirit in secret was contriving everything through them as it wished. Truth is sown in every place, the truth which was from the beginning. And many see it as it is sown. But (only) a few who see it reap it. (17) Some said: Mary conceived of the Holy Spirit. They are in error. What they are saying they do not know. When did a woman ever conceive of a woman? Mary is the virgin whom no power defiled, who is a great anathema to the Hebrews, the apostles and apostolic men. This virgin whom no power defiled . . . . the powers defile them, and the Lord would not have said 'My Father which [is] in heaven' unless he had had another father, but he said simply . . . . (18) The Lord said to the disciples . . . .

104 . . . . come into the house of the Father, but do not receive (anything) in the house of the Father and do not take (anything) away.

(19) Jesus is a hidden name, Christ is a revealed name. Because of this Jesus on the one hand does not exist in any other tongue, but his name is Jesus as they call him. But Christ, his name in the Syriac is the Messiah, but in the Greek it is the Christ. Altogether, all the others have it according to the language of each one among them. The Nazarene is the one that is revealed in that which is hidden. (20) The Christ has all things in himself, whether man or angel or mystery, and the Father. (21) Those who say that the Lord died first and then rose up are in error, for he rose up first and then died. If anyone does not first attain the resurrection, he will die. As God lives (?), this one would [die] (22) No-one will hide a great thing (πρᾶγμα) and precious in a great thing, but many times has one cast countless myriads into a thing worth an assarion. So it is with the soul. It is a precious thing, and came to be in a despised body. (23) Some are afraid lest they rise naked. Because of this they wish to rise in the flesh, and they do not know that those who bear the flesh [it is they who are] naked; those who . . . . . . themselves to unclothe themselves [it is they who are] not naked. 'Flesh [and blood shall] not inherit the kingdom [of God']. What is this which will

not inherit? This which we have. But what is this which will inherit? That which belongs to Jesus with his blood. Because of this he said: He who shall not eat my flesh and drink my blood has no life in him. What is it? His flesh is the logos, and his blood is the Holy Spirit. He who has received these has food and drink and clothing. For myself, I find fault with the others who say that it will not rise. Then both of these are at fault. Thou sayest that the flesh will not rise; but tell me what will rise, that we may honour thee. Thou sayest the spirit in the flesh, and it is also this light in the flesh. But this too is a logos which is in the flesh, for whatever thou shalt say thou sayest nothing outside the flesh. It is necessary to rise in this flesh, in which everything exists. (24) In this world those who put on garments are better than the garments. In the kingdom of heaven the garments are better than those who have put them on by water and fire, which purify the whole place. (25) Those who are revealed through those who are revealed, those who are hidden through those who are hidden. There are some hidden through those who are revealed. There is water in water, there is fire in a chrism. (26) Jesus took them all by stealth, for he did not reveal himself as he [really] was, but he revealed himself as they would be able to see him . . . . he revealed himself to them . . . . to the great as great . . . . little as little . . . . .

106 to angels as an angel, and to men as a man. Because of this his logos hid itself from every-one. Some indeed saw him, while they thought they were seeing themselves, but when he appeared to his disciples in glory on the mount he was not small. He became great, but he made the disciples great, that they might be able to see him in his greatness. He said on that day in the thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία): Thou who hast joined the perfect, the light, with the Holy Spirit, unite the angels with us also, the images. (27) Do not despise the lamb, for without it it is not possible to see the king. No-one will be able to enter in towards the king if he is naked. (28) The man of heaven, many are his sons more than the man of earth. If the sons of Adam are many, but nonetheless die, how much more the sons of the perfect man, they who do not die but are begotten at all times. (29) The father makes a son, and the son has not the power to make a son. For he who is begotten has not the power to beget, but the son gets for himself only brothers, not sons. (30) All who are begotten in the world are begotten of nature, and the others of [the Spirit.] Those who are begotten of him [cry out] there to the man . . . . from the promise because of the . . . . . . above. (31) . . . . out of the mouth . . . . the logos came forth thence

he would nourish . . . . from the mouth and become perfect. For the perfect conceive through a kiss and give birth. Because of this we also kiss one another. We receive conception from the grace which is among us. (32) There were three who walked with the Lord at all times, Mary his mother and her sister and Magdalene, whom they called his consort (κοινωνός). For Mary was his sister and his mother and his consort. (33) The Father and the Son are simple names; the Holy Spirit is a double name. For they are everywhere: they are above, they are below; they are in secret, they are in the revealed. The Holy Spirit is in the revelation, it is below, it is in secret, it is above. (34) The saints are ministered unto by the evil powers, for they are blind because of the Holy Spirit, that they may think they are serving a man when they act for the saints. Because of this a disciple asked the Lord one day for something of this world. He said to him: Ask thy mother, and she will give thee of that which is another's. (35) The apostles said to the disciples: May our whole offering obtain salt. They called . . . . . . salt. Without it no offering is acceptable. (36) But Sophia is barren, without child. Because of this she is called . . . . salt. The place where they . . . . in their way the Holy Spirit . . . .

108 ..... many are her children. (37) What the father possesses belongs to the son, and he also, the son, so long as he is small is not entrusted with what is his. But when he becomes a man his father gives him all that he possesses. (38) They that are lost whom the Spirit begets, they also go astray through it. Because of this, by this one breath the fire blazes and is put out. (39) Echamoth is one thing and Echmoth another. Echamoth is simply Sophia, but Echmoth the Sophia of death .... (dittog.), which is the one which knows death, which is called the little Sophia. (40) There are animals which are subject to man, like the bull and the ass and others of this kind. There are others which are not subject and live apart in the deserts. Man ploughs the field by means of the beasts which are subject and from this he feeds himself and the beasts, whether those which are subject or those which are not subject. So is it with the perfect man. Through powers which are subject he ploughs, preparing for everything to come into being. For because of this the whole place stands, whether the good or the evil, and the right and the left. The Holy Spirit tends everything and rules all the powers which are subject and those which are not subject, with those which are separate For indeed it .... include them in order that .... (41) ..... moulded him .... thou wouldst find his sons

noble creations (πλάσμα). But if he was not moulded but begotten, thou wouldst find that his seed was noble. But now he was moulded and begot. What nobility is this? (42) Adultery came into being first, afterwards murder; and he was begotten in adultery, for he was the son of the serpent. Because of this he became a murderer, even as his father also. And he slew his brother. But every association which came into being between those unlike one another is adultery. (43) God is a dyer. As the good dyes, which are called genuine, die with the things which are dyed in them, so with those that God has dyed. Since his dyes are immortal, they are immortal through his colours. But God dips (βαπτίζειν) what he dips in water. (44) It is not possible for any to see anything of those that are established unless he becomes like them. Not as with man when he is in the world: he sees the sun, but is not a sun; and he sees the heaven and the earth and all other things, but he is not these— so is it with the truth. But thou didst see something of that place and thou didst become these: Thou didst see the Spirit, thou didst become spirit. Thou didst see Christ, thou didst become Christ. Thou didst see the Father, thou shalt become Father. Because of this, [here] thou seest everything and [dost not see] thyself. But thou seest thyself [in that place]. For what thou seest thou shalt [become]. (45) Faith receives, love gives . . . . .

110 ..... without faith. No-one will be able to give without love. Because of this, that we may receive we believe, but in order that we may give in truth, since if anyone does not give in love he has no profit from what he has given. (46) He who has not received the Lord is still a Hebrew. (47) The apostles who were before us called (him) thus: Jesus the Nazorean, the Messiah, that is, Jesus the Nazorean, the Christ. The last name is Christ, the first is Jesus, that in the midst is the Nazarene. Messiah has two meanings, both Christ and the measured. Jesus in Hebrew is the redemption. Nazara is the truth. The Nazarene accordingly is the truth. Christ is measured. The Nazarene and Jesus are they who have been measured. (48) When the pear is cast down in the mud it does not become dishonoured the more, nor if it is anointed with balsam oil will it become more precious. But it has its worth in the eyes of its owner at all times. So with the sons of God wherever they may be. For they have the value in the eyes of their Father. (49) If thou sayest 'I am a Jew,' no-one will be moved. If thou sayest 'I am a Roman,' no-one will be disturbed. If thou sayest, 'I am a Greek, a barbarian, a slave, a free man,' no-one will be troubled. If thou sayest 'I am a Christian' .... will tremble. May it be .... this fashion. This one who .... cannot endure .... name. (50) God is a

man-eater. Because of this they slay the man for him. Before they slew the man they were slaying the beasts. For no gods were they for whom they slew. (51) Vessels of glass and vessels of earthenware are made by means of fire. But if vessels of glass are broken they are made again, for they are brought into being by a breath. But vessels of earthenware, if they break, are destroyed, for they come into being without breath. (52) An ass which turns a mill-stone did a hundred miles walking. When it was loosed, it found that it was still at the same place. There are men who make many journeys, but make no progress anywhere. When evening came for them, they saw neither city nor village, neither creation nor nature, power and angel. In vain did the wretches labour. (53) The eucharist (*εὐχαριστία*) is Jesus. For he is called in the Syrian Pharisatha, which is 'the spread out.' For Jesus came crucifying the world. (54) The Lord went into the dye-works of Levi. He took seventy-two colours and threw them into the vat. He took them out all white. And he said: Even so came the Son of †the Son of †Man . . . . (55) The Sophia whom they call barren is the mother of the angels. And the consort of [Christ is] Mary Magdalene. [The Lord loved Mary] more than [all] the disciples, and kissed her on her [mouth] often. The others too . . . . .

112 . . . . they said to him 'Why do you love her more than all of us?' The Saviour answered and said to them 'Why do I not love you like her?' (56) A blind man and one who sees, when they are in the darkness the two do not differ from one another. But when the light comes, then he who sees will see the light, and he who is blind will remain in darkness. (57) The Lord said 'Blessed is he who is before he came into being. For he who is, both was and shall be'. (58) The highness of man is not revealed, but is in secret. Because of this he is lord of the beasts which are stronger than he, which are great according to the revealed and the hidden. And this gives them their continuance. But if the man separates from them, they slay one another and bite one another. And they ate one another, since they did not find any food. But now they have found food since man worked the earth. (59) If anyone goes down to the water and comes up without receiving anything and says 'I am a Christian,' he has taken the name at interest. But if he receive the Holy Spirit he has the gift of the name. He who has received a gift is not deprived of it, but he who has received at interest upon it, it is demanded (of him). (60) This is the way it happens . . . . . if any-one is in a mystery . . . . . The mystery of marriage is a great one. For . . . . For the existence of [the world is based on men,] but the existence of [men on] marriage. Understand the association [undefiled?], for it has [a great] power. Its image

is in a [defilement of the body] (61) Among the unclean spirits there are male and female. The male are they which unite (κοινωνεῖν) with the souls which inhabit (πολιτεύεσθαι) a female form; but the female are they which are mingled with those in a male form, through a disobedient (one). And none shall be able to escape them, since they detain him, if he does not receive a male power or a female, which is the bridegroom or the bride. But one receives from the mirrored (εἰκονικός) bridal chamber. When the ignorant women see a male sitting alone, they leap down upon him and sport with him and defile him. So also the ignorant men, when they see a beautiful woman sitting alone they persuade her, they compel her, wishing to defile her. But if they see the man and his wife sitting beside one another, the female cannot come in to the man, nor can the male come in to the woman. So if the image and the angel are united with one another neither can any venture to go in to the man or the woman. He who comes out of the world, they cannot detain him any longer, because he was in the world. It is manifest that he is above desire .... [and] fear. He is master over .... He is more precious than envy. But if .... comes, they seize him and throttle [him]. And how will [this one] be able to escape the .... how will he be able to ..... often some .... We are faithful ....

114 .... demons For if they had the Holy Spirit the unclean spirits would not cleave unto them. (62) Be not fearful of the flesh, nor love it. If thou fear before it, it will become master over thee. If thou love it, it will swallow and paralyse thee (63) Either will he be in this world or in the resurrection or in the places of the midst. God forbid that I be found in them. In this world there is good and evil. Its good is not good, and its evil not evil. But there is evil after this world, which is truly evil, namely what they call the Midst. This is death. While we are in this world it is fitting for us to acquire for ourselves the resurrection, in order that when we strip off the flesh we may be found in Rest and not walk in the Midst. For many go astray on the way. For it is good to come forth from the world before man yet sinned. (64) Some neither wish nor are able; but others if they wish gain no profit, since they did not do ..... For the wish made them sinners. As for the unwillingness, righteousness will be hidden from them both, and the will .... not the deed. (65) An apostolic man who [was] in Asia saw some .... their house on fire and .... air in the fires lying .... the fire. There is water in .... and they said to them .... power to save .... their will. They received [death as a] punishment, this which is called

the [outer] darkness. [The enemy comes] out of water and fire. (66) The [soul] and the spirit came into being from water and fire and light, which the son of the bride-chamber . . . . . The fire is the chrism, the light is the fire. I do not speak of this fire which has no form, but of the other whose form is white, which is of light and beautiful and gives beauty. (67) Truth did not come into the world naked, but it came in the types and the images. It will not receive it in any other fashion. There is a rebirth and an image of rebirth. It is truly fitting to cause them to be born again through the image. What is the resurrection? And the image through the image, it is fitting that it rise up. The bride-chamber and the image through the image, it is fitting that they go in to the truth, which is the apocatastasis. It is fitting for those who do not only receive the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, but have obtained them for themselves. If anyone does not obtain them for himself, the name also will be taken from him. But one receives them in the chrism of the fulness of the power of the [Cross], which the apostles call 'the right' and 'the left.' For this one is no longer a Christian but a Christ. (68) The Lord did everything in a mystery, a baptism and a chrism and a eucharist and a redemption and a bride-chamber. (69) . . . . . [He said] I came to . . . . like the upper . . . . . . like the . . . . all in the place . . . . this place through . . . . they who say . . . . there is one above . . . . are wrong. He who is revealed . . . .

116 . . . . . that . . . . . which is called the one who is below, and he to whom the hidden belongs is that one who is above him. For it is good that they should say 'The inner and the outer, with what is outside the outer.' Because of this the Lord called destruction 'the outer darkness, outside which there is nothing.' He said 'My Father which is in secret.' He said 'Go into thy chamber and shut thy door upon thee, and pray to thy Father which is in secret,' which is he who is within them all. But he who is within them all is the pleroma. After him there is no other inside of him. This is he of whom they say 'He who is above them.' (70) Before Christ some came forth. Whence they came they are no longer able to go in, and they went where they are no longer able to come out. But Christ came. Those who went in he brought out, and those who went out he brought in. (71) When Eve was in Adam, there was no death; but when she was separated from him death came into being. Again if <she> go in, and he take <her> to himself, death will no longer exist. (72) 'My God, my God, why, Lord, hast thou forsaken me?' He said these words on the Cross, for he separated the place . . . . which was brought forth from the . . . . through God. . . . . from the dead . . . . but . . . . being perfect . . . . of flesh, but this . . . . is the true flesh . . . . not a true, but . . . . images of the true.

(73) A bridal chamber is not for the beasts, nor is it for the slaves, nor for the women defiled; but it is for the free men and virgins. (74) Through the Holy Spirit we are indeed born, but we are born again through Christ. In the two we are anointed through the Spirit, and when we have been born we are united. (75) None shall be able to see himself either in water or in a mirror without light. Nor again wilt thou be able to see in light without water or mirror. Because of this it is fitting to baptize in the two, in light and water. But the light is the chrism. (76) There were three houses for places of offering in Jerusalem. The one was open to the west and was called the holy. Another was open to the south and was called the holy of the holy (one). The third was open to the east and was called the holy of the holy ones, the place where the high priest entered in alone. Baptism is the holy house, ... is the holy of the holy one, but the holy of the holy ones is the bridal chamber. Baptism has the resurrection ..... redemption to hasten into the bridal chamber. But the bridal chamber is superior to ..... thou wilt not find .... those who pray .... Jerusalem .... Jerusalem .... Jerusalem who wait for .... which is called .... holy of the holy ones .... veil .... bridal chamber if not the image .....

118 .... above .... its veil was rent from the top to the bottom. For it was fitting for some from below to go upward. (77) Those who put on the perfect light, the powers do not see them, and they are not able to restrain them. But one will put on the light in mystery in the union. (78) If the woman had not separated from the man, she would not die with the man. His separation became the beginning of death. Because of this Christ came, in order that he might remove the separation which was from the beginning, and again unite the two; and that he might give life to those who died in the separation, and unite them. (79) But the woman is united to her husband in the bridal chamber. But those who have united in the bridal chamber will no longer be separated. Because of this Eve separated from Adam, because she was not united with him in the bridal chamber. (80) The soul of Adam came into being from a breath. Its consort is the [spirit. The spirit] which was given to him is his mother .... his soul they gave to him a .... her place. When he .... words which are higher than the powers. They bewitched him .... spiritual union .... hidden .... bridal chamber, that .... (81) Jesus revealed .... Jordan the fulness of the kingdom of heaven which came into being] before the all.

Again, he was begotten. [Again, he was begotten as a son] Again, he was anointed. [Again] he was redeemed. Again, he saved. (82) If I may utter a mystery, the Father of the all united with the virgin who came down, and a fire shone for him on that day. He revealed the great bridal chamber. Because of this his body which came into being on that day came out of the bridal chamber, in the manner of him who came into being from the bridegroom and the bride. So Jesus established the all in it through these. And it is fitting for each one of the disciples to enter into his Rest.

(83) Adam came into being from two virgins, from the Spirit and from the virgin earth. Because of this Christ was born of a virgin, in order that he might set in order the stumbling which came to pass in the beginning.

(84) There are two trees in paradise. The one produces beasts; the other produces man. Adam ate from the tree which produced beasts, and becoming a beast he begat beasts. Because of this they worship .... Adam. The tree .... fruit .... eat of .... fruit .... begets men .... worship the man .... God created [man and]

120 man created God. (85) So is it in the world. Men make gods and they worship their creations. It would be fitting for the gods to worship men. (86) As the truth of the works of man is, they come into being from his power. Because of this they are called the powers. His works are his sons, who came into being from a Rest. Because of this his power dwells (πολιτεύεσθαι) in his works, but the Rest is manifest in the children. And thou wilt find this penetrating even to the image. And this is the man after the image (εἰκονικός), doing his works by his power but in his rest producing his children. (87) In this world the slaves serve the free men. In the kingdom of heaven the free will minister unto the slaves, the children of the bride-[chamber] will minister to the children of the marriage. The children of the bride-chamber a name . . . . The Rest . . . . one another. They have no need . . . . . (88) The vision . . . . they are more . . . . in those who are in . . . . glories of the . . . . are not (89) . . . . go down to the water . . . . he will redeem him . . . . perfect those who . . . . in his name. For he said . . . . that we should fulfil all

righteousness. (90) Those who say 'They will die first and rise again' are in error. If they do not first receive the resurrection while they live, when they die they will receive nothing. So also they speak about baptism, saying that baptism is a great thing, because if (people) receive it they will live. (91) Philip the apostle said 'Joseph the carpenter planted a garden because he needed the wood for his trade. It was he who made the Cross from the trees which he planted. And his seed hung on that which he planted. His seed was Jesus, but the planting was the Cross.' (92) But the tree of life is in the midst of the garden (παράδεισος) and the olive tree from which the chrism is made by him for the resurrection. (93) This world is an eater of corpses. All that is eaten in it is also hated. The truth is an eater of life. Because of this none of those who are nourished from [the truth will] die. Jesus came forth from (that) place and brought the foods from there, and to those who wished he gave [life, that they might not] die. (94) . . . . para-dise . . . . para-dise. There is . . . . is. There is no . . . . of God . . . . man in it . . . . this paradise . . . . they will say to me [O man, eat] of this or do not eat [of this according to thy]

122 wish. This is the place where I will eat all things, since there is the tree of knowledge (γνῶσις). That one slew Adam, but here the tree of knowledge made man alive. The law was the tree. It has power to give the knowledge (γνῶσις) of good and evil. It neither made him cease from evil, nor did it set him in the good, but it created death for those who ate of it. For when he said 'Eat this, do not eat that,' it became the beginning of death. (95) The chrism is superior to baptism, for from the chrism are we called Christians, not because of the baptism; and Christ is (so) called because of the chrism. For the Father anointed the Son, and the Son anointed the apostles, and the apostles anointed us. He who is anointed possesses the All. He possesses the resurrection, the light, the Cross, the Holy Spirit. The Father gave him this in the bridal chamber, he received. (96) The Father was in the [Son] and the Son in the Father. This is [the] kingdom of heaven. (97) Well did the Lord say 'Some went into the kingdom of heaven laughing and came out .... a Christian .... and immediately .... down to the water and came .... the All. Because .... was [a] trifle, but .... despised this .... the kingdom of [heaven] .... if he despise .... and despise it as a trifle [he will come out] laughing. (98) So is it also

with the bread and the cup and the oil, even if there be something else higher than these.

(99) The world came into being through a transgression. For he who created it wanted to create it indestructible and immortal. He fell away and did not attain to his hope. For the indestructibility of the world did not exist, and the indestructibility of him who made the world did not exist; for there is no indestructibility of things, but of sons, nor will anything be able to achieve indestructibility if it does not become a son. But he who has not the power to receive, how much more will he be unable to give?

(100) The cup of prayer contains wine and water, since it is appointed as the type of the blood for which thanks is given. And it is full of the Holy Spirit, and it belongs to the wholly perfect man. When we drink this, we shall receive for ourselves the perfect man. (101) The living water is a body. It is fitting that we put on the living man. Because of this when he is about to go down to the water he unclothes himself, in order that he may put this one on. (102) A horse begets a horse, a man begets man, a god begets god. So it is with the bride-groom and the bride. [Their children] originate from the bridal chamber. There was no Jew [who came] from the Greeks [so long as the law] existed and [we too had our] [origin] from the Jews [before we became] Christians . . . . and they called them . . . . the chosen race of the . . . .

124 and the true man and the Son of man and the seed of the Son of man. This race they call true in the world. (103) These are the place where the sons of the bride-chamber are. The union is in this world man and woman, the place of the power and the weakness. In the aeon the form of the union is different, but we call them by these names. But there are others which are above every name (104) that is named, and they are superior to the strong. For where there is violence there also are those who are better than the violence. It is not the one, it is the other, but these two are one only. This is the one which will not be able to rise above the heart of flesh. (105) All who possess the All, it is not fitting for them all to know themselves. Some indeed, if they do not know themselves, will not enjoy what they possess, but those who have come to know themselves will enjoy them. (106) Not only will they be unable to grasp the perfect man, but they will not be able to see him. For if they see him they will grasp him. In no other way will any-one be able to receive for himself this grace, unless he put on the perfect light and himself become perfect light .... he will go .... this is the perfect .... (107) [It is fitting] that we should become [perfect men] before we come [out of this world]. He who has received the All [without being master of] these places will [not] be able to be [master of] that place, but will [go to the Midst] as imperfect.

Only Jesus knows the end of this one. (108) The holy man is holy altogether, down to his body. For if he has received the bread he will make it holy, or the cup, or anything else that he receives, purifying them. And how will he not purify the body also? (109) Even as Jesus perfected the water of baptism, so did he pour out death. Because of this we go down indeed into the water, but we do not go down unto death, in order that we may not be poured out into the spirit of the world. When it blows, it causes the winter to come into being. When the Holy Spirit breathes, then the summer comes. (110) He who has the knowledge (γνῶσις) of the truth is a free man, but the free man does not sin, for 'he who sins is the slave of sin.' The mother is the truth, but knowledge (γνῶσις) is the father. Those to whom it is not given to sin, the world calls them free. Those to whom it is not given to sin, the knowledge of the truth lifts up the hearts, which means it makes them free and makes them high above the whole place. But love buildeth up. He who has become free through knowledge plays the servant because of love to those who have not yet been able to receive the freedom of knowledge. But knowledge makes them capable of becoming free. Love [does not take] anything, for how [will it take anything when everything] belongs to it? It does not [say 'This is mine'] or 'That is mine,' [but it says 'It is] thine.' (111) The love of . . . . is wine and fragrance. They all enjoy

126 it, those who shall be anointed with it. They also enjoy (it) who stand outside them, while the anointed are standing (there). If those who are anointed with ointment stop anointin themselves(and go away, those who are not anointed but only stand outside of them continue in their evil odour. The Samaritan gave nothing to the wounded man except wine and oil. It is nothing other than the ointment. And he healed the wounds. For love covereth a multitude of sins. (112) He whom the woman loves, those she will bear are like him: if her husband, they are like her husband; if it is an adulterer, they are like the adulterer. Often if a woman sleeps with her husband of necessity, but her heart is with the adulterer with whom she is wont to consort, then what she bears she bears in the likeness of the adulterer. But you who are with the Son of God, love not the world but love the Lord, that those you bring forth may not be like unto the world but may be like the Lord. (113) Man mixes with man, horse mixes with horse, ass mixes with ass. The kinds mix with those of like kind. So also spirit is wont to mix with spirit and the logos to consort with the logos [and the light] to consort [with the light. If thou] become man [the man will love thee]. If thou become [spirit] the spirit will be joined to thee. If thou become logos, it is the logos which

will mix with thee. If thou become light, it is the light which will consort with thee. If thou become one of those who belong above, those who belong above will find their rest in thee. If thou become horse or ass or bull or dog or sheep or any other animal of those outside and those below, then neither man nor spirit nor logos nor light nor those above nor those within will be able to love thee. They will not be able to find rest in thee and thou hast no part in them.

(114) He who is a slave against his will will be able to become free. He who has become free by the favour of his master and has sold himself into slavery will no longer be able to be free. (115) The husbandry of the world (is made possible) through four forms. They gather them into the barn through water, earth, wind and light. And the husbandry of God is likewise through four, faith and hope and love and knowledge. Our earth is faith, in which we take root. The water is hope, through which [we are nourished]. The wind is love, through which we grow. But the light is knowledge, through which we [ripen]

(116) Grace is . . . .
man of earth . . . .
above the heaven . . . .
blessed is he who did not . . . .

128 their souls. This is Jesus the Christ. He deceived the whole place and did not burden anyone. That is why the one of this kind is a blessed one, because he is a perfect man. For this is the Logos. (117) Ask us about him, since it is difficult to set him upright. How shall we be able to accomplish (κατορθοῦν) this great thing? (118) How will he give rest to every-one? First and foremost it is not fitting to grieve (λυπεῖν) anyone, whether great or small, believer or unbeliever; then to give rest to those who rest upon the good. There are some whose advantage it is to give rest to him who is well. He who does good cannot give them rest, for he does not come of his own will. But he cannot grieve, since he does not cause them to be oppressed. But he who is well grieves them often. He is not so, but their wickedness grieves them. He who has the nature gives joy to the good. But some through this grieve badly. (119) A householder acquired everything, whether son or slave or cattle, or dog or pig or corn or barley or chaff or grass or [bones] or flesh or acorn. But he was a wise man, and knew the food of each. Before the children he set bread [and oil and meat.] To the slaves he gave castor [oil and] meal, and to the cattle [he gave barley] and chaff and grass. [To the] dogs he cast bones, [to the pigs] he threw acorns

129 and of bread. So the disciple of God. If he is wise he understands (αἰσθάνεσθαι) the discipleship. The bodily forms will not deceive him, but he will look to the state (διάθεσις) of the soul of each one and speak with him. There are many beasts in the world which bear the form of man. If he recognize them, to the swine he will cast acorns, but to the cattle he will throw barley and chaff and grass; to the dogs he will throw bones; to the slaves he will give the first, to the sons he will give the perfect. (120) There is the Son of man and there is the son of the Son of man. The Lord is the Son of man and the son of the Son of man is he who is created through the Son of man. The Son of Man received from God the power to create. He has (also) the ability to beget. (121) He who has received the ability to create is a creature. He who has received begetting is an off-spring. He who creates cannot beget. He who begets has power to create. But they say 'He who creates, begets.' But his off-spring is a creature. Because of this the offspring are not his children but . . . . He who creates, works [openly] and is himself [visible] He who begets [works in secret] and . . . . image. He who creates [creates] openly. But he who begets [begets] sons in secret. (122) [Nobody will be able to] know what is [the day when the man]

130 and the woman unite with one another, except them alone. For marriage in the world is a mystery for those who have taken a wife. But if the marriage of uncleanness be hid, how much more is the marriage undefiled a true mystery. It is not fleshly but pure, and does not belong to desire but to the will. It does not belong to the darkness or the night, but belongs to the day and the light. If a marriage is (openly) exposed, it becomes harlotry, and the bride plays the harlot not only when she receives the seed of another man but even if she leaves her bed and is seen. Only she may reveal herself to her father and her mother, and the friend of the bridegroom and the sons of the bridegroom. To these it is given to enter every day into the bridal chamber. But the others, let them desire even to hear her voice and enjoy the ointment, and let them be nourished from the crumbs that fall from the table like the dogs. Bridegrooms and brides belong to the bridal chamber. None shall be able to see the bridegroom with the bride except he become this. (123) When Abraham . . . . . that he was to see what he was to see, he circumcised the flesh of uncircumcision, teaching us that it is fitting to destroy the flesh . . . . this world so long as their . . . . and are alive [If they are revealed] they die according to [the pattern] of the man who was revealed. [As long as] the bowels of the man are hidden, the man

131 is alive. When his bowels are exposed and come out of him, the man will die. So also with the tree: while its root is hidden it sprouts . . . . If its root is exposed, the tree dries up. So is it with every birth that is in the world, not only with the revealed but with the hidden. For so long as the root of wickedness is hidden, it is strong. But when it is recognized it is dissolved. But if it is revealed it perishes. That is why the logos says: Already the axe is laid at the root of the tree. It will not cut—what is cut sprouts again—but the axe delves down to the bottom until it brings up the root. But Jesus plucked out the root of the whole place, but the others partially. As for us, let each one of us dig down after the root of evil which is within him, and let him pluck it out of his heart to the root. But it will be plucked out if we recognize it. But if we are ignorant of it, it strikes root in us and brings forth its fruit in our hearts. It is master over us and we are its slaves. It takes us captive, so that we do what we do not want and what we want we do [not] do. It is powerful because we have not recognized it. While it exists it is active . . . . is the mother of . . . . Ignorance [is the servant of (?) . . . . . . those that come from [ignorance (?) . .] neither were nor [are] nor shall be. [But those who are in the truth (?)],

132 they will be perfect when all the truth is revealed. For the truth is like ignorance: while it is hidden it abides in itself, but when it is revealed and recognized it is praised inasmuch as it is stronger than ignorance and error. It gives freedom. The Logos said: If you know the truth the truth will make you free. Ignorance is a slave, knowledge is freedom. When we recognize the truth we shall find the fruits of the truth in our hearts. If we unite with it, it will bring our fulfilment. (124) Now we have the manifest things of the creation. We say they are the strong which are honoured. But the hidden are the weak which are despised. So is it with the revealed in the truth: they are weak and despised, but the hidden are the strong and are honoured. But the mysteries of the truth are revealed as types and images. (125) But the bridal chamber is hidden. It is the holy of the holy one. The veil at first concealed how God controlled the creation, but when the veil is rent and the things within are exposed this house will be left deserted, or rather will be [destroyed]. But the whole deity will not flee [from] these places again into the holy of the holy [ones], for it will not be able to mix with the [unmixed light and] the [flawless] pleroma, but will be under the wings of the Cross [and under its] arms. This ark will be [for them] deliverance when the flood

133 of water becomes powerful over them. If some are in the tribe of the priesthood, these will be able to go within the veil with the high priest. Because of this the veil was not rent at the top only, since it would be open only for those above; nor was it rent at the bottom only, since it would be revealed only to those below; but it was rent from top to bottom. Those above opened to us who are below, in order that we might go in to the secret of the truth. This truly is the honoured which is strong. But we shall go in there through despised symbols and weaknesses. They are indeed despised in comparison with the perfect glory. There is a glory that is higher than glory, there is power which is above power. Because of this the perfect things are open to us, and the hidden things of the truth; and the holy things of the holy ones are revealed, and the bridal chamber invites us in. Insofar as it is hidden, wickedness is indeed brought to naught, but it is not taken away from the midst of the seed of the Holy Spirit; they are slaves of wickedness. But when it is revealed, then the perfect light will pour out upon every one. And all those who are in it will receive [the chrism]. Then the slaves will be free, and the captives delivered. (126) Every plant in heaven my Father in heaven plants ..... pluck it out. Those who are separated will be united. [The empty] will be filled. All who [go in] to the bridal chamber will [beget the light]. For they do not beget in the manner of the marriages which .... happen in the night. The fire ....

134 in the night and is put out. But the mysteries of this marriage are perfected in the day and the light. That day or its light does not set. (127) If anyone becomes a son of the bridal chamber he will receive the light. If anyone does not receive it while he is in this world, he will not receive it in the other place. He who has received that light will not be seen, nor can he be detained; and none shall be able to torment one of this kind even if he dwell in the world. And again when he goes out of the world he has already received the truth in the images. The world has become the aeon. For the aeon is for him a pleroma and it is in this manner: it is revealed to him alone, not hidden in the darkness and the night but hidden in a perfect day and a holy light.

The Gospel according to Philip.

COMMENTARY

99 A Hebrew man makes a Hebrew,
and they call him thus:
a proselyte. But a proselyte does not
make a proselyte. [Those who] . . . . the truth
are like . . . .
and they make others . . . .
100 . . . . wish for them that they may
come into being.

The manuscript is damaged at the foot of pl. 99 and the top of pl. 100, but the first two sentences can be restored with some confidence. Unfortunately in the following lines the key words are missing, and the remaining letters provide no real clue as to their content, whether a contrast or an analogy. Schenke restores: '[Those who produce] truth are as they come into being, and they make others [who have a similarity with the] truth. [They] wish for them that they may come into being' ('produce' and 'make' here render the German *erschaffen*, which represents the Coptic word translated 'make' in 99. 29, 32 and 34). If this be correct, 'those who produce truth' remain in their original state, but win over others to a kinship with the truth; it is their desire that these others should become like themselves. Dr. Till, however, notes that the word rendered 'wish' (100. 1) is always *wōsh* in this text, not *wōshe*; moreover the first letter is indistinct, and the word might be *rōshe*: 'it suffices for them that they come into being.'

For the opening lines two possible interpretations may be suggested: (*a*) A Jew who converts another man makes him a Jew. This second man is *called* a proselyte, but is in fact a Jew, possessing 'equal rights with the native born' (Moore, *Judaism* i. 327). If, however, this second man converts a third, the latter is not a proselyte, but a Jew. If this be correct, the point would seem to lie in the contrast between the name and the reality (cf. 101. 23ff.); but the statement that 'a proselyte does not

make a proselyte' would present some difficulty. (*b*) Dr. Schenke refers to 106. 22–26, where the same Coptic word is used of a father 'making' (i.e., as the context shows, begetting) a son. Now a Rabbinic text (Baba Metzia 4. 10) forbids anyone to remind the son of a proselyte of the past ways of his fathers, which seems to indicate that he was accepted as a native Jew. Again, 'he who brings a Gentile near (to God) is as though he created him' (Gen. R. 39. 14). On this view the point would lie in the distinction between conversion and natural birth: the Hebrew 'creates' a Hebrew by converting a Gentile, but the proselyte who has a son does not thereby produce another proselyte. According to Moore (i. 329ff.), a proselyte was on the same footing as Jews by birth, so far as religious duties and privileges go; but there is evidence that proselytes were never held in the same esteem as born Jews (in Horay. 3. 8 they rank only above freed slaves, in Kidd. 4. 7 they are regarded as of like standing; the latter passage shows that there was also a differing view). In view of the obscurity of the passage and the lacunae in the text any attempt at interpretation must be precarious, but the second alternative appears to have more in its favour.

100 2 (2) The [slave] seeks only to be free, but he does not seek after the possessions (οὐσία) of his master. But the son is not only a son, but lays claim to the inheritance (κληρονομία) of the father.

'Slave' is necessary to the sense, although the visible letters do not seem to fit either of the normal Coptic words. *lays claim to the inheritance:* lit. 'ascribes to himself.' The passage recalls Paul's teaching in Gal. iv. 1–7 (a later passage, 108. 1–6, seems to echo the opening verses of this chapter). Since Paul concludes 'if a son, then an heir of God through Christ,' it is not without interest that the next section in Philip speaks of inheriting. This may, however, be due to the catchword

system of connection, the third 'saying' being associated with the second because of the occurrence of 'inheritance' in 100. 5.

100 6 (3) Those who inherit (κληρονομεῖν)
dead (things) are themselves dead,
and they inherit dead (things). Those
who inherit what is living are alive,
and inherit (both) what is living and the
dead. The dead do not inherit
anything. For how will the dead (man) inherit?
If the dead man inherits
what is living he will not die, but the dead
will live the more.

This passage presents a problem for the translator, since the Greek κληρονομεῖν may mean either 'inherit' or 'be heir to.' Schenke uses *beerben*, which assumes the latter meaning. Again, Coptic has two genders only, so that it is not always possible to determine whether the reference is to a person or a thing. There is therefore extensive scope for variation, e.g.: 'Those who are heirs to the dead are themselves dead, and they inherit dead things. Those who are heirs to the living (one) are alive, and inherit both the living and the dead.' To avoid pre-judging the issue, the translation renders κληρονομεῖν uniformly by 'inherit,' and 'the dead' and 'the living' have been taken to be neuter. The word rendered 'the dead' is plural, 'the living' singular. In line 11 'the dead' (plur.) is clearly the subject, and hence refers to persons, but this need not necessarily be the case for the preceding lines. In 12–14 the word is in the singular. For 'death' and 'life' in Gnostic thought cf. Gärtner 159ff.; on p. 167 he refers to 'the contrast between death, which is this material world, and life, which is won through the Saviour,' and adduces this present passage in a note. The 'dead' are material men, or the things of this world; 'what is living' is probably *gnosis*, or life itself, or perhaps the Saviour (cf. 'the living' as a title of Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas). The general sense is clear: those whose interests are confined to the things

of this world are in fact dead—only the Gnostic is truly alive; but if a man attains to *gnosis* he will not die, but live. This conception is not, however, purely Gnostic (for N.T. parallels cf. *T.W.B.* ii. 864 and note 267 there).

100 15 (4) A Gentile man
does not die, for he has never lived that
he should die. He who has come to believe in the truth has found life, and this man is in danger of dying, for he is alive since the day Christ came.

The theme is continued, but from another angle. A Gentile has never really known life, therefore he cannot die. A Christian, however, who possesses that knowledge of God which is eternal life (cf. *Jn.* xvii. 3), may relapse and so lose this life. A New Testament background for such speculations may be found e.g. in Rom. vi or Col. iii. 3f., to go no further afield (for 'life' generally in Biblical thought see the whole article referred to in the previous note, *T.W.B.* ii. 833ff.). For the Gnostic, of course, 'the truth' would be the truth of *gnosis*. It is possible that the Gentile here represents the merely material man, the 'Hebrews' of line 22 the psychic, and 'Christians' (line 24) the Gnostics; but this is not explicitly stated, and there is always a danger of reading more into the text than it actually says. It is no small part of the interest, and the difficulty, of such texts as the Gospel of Philip, the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Truth that they can so often be read on two levels: some passages seem quite innocuous, and may be paralleled in perfectly 'orthodox' writers, yet they may be so interpreted as to present a thoroughly Gnostic meaning. The problem is in such cases to determine (*a*) what they meant for the author and the group to which he belonged, (*b*) what they may have meant in any sources which he employed, and (*c*) what they meant for the Gnostics who made use of them. The three questions are not necessarily one and the same. In the present instance there

would seem to be more in favour of Grant's suggestion (*J.B.L.* 79 (1960) 10) of 'a movement from Judaism to Christianity to Gnosticism' (cf. on lines 21–24 below). 19 *since the day Christ came:* Schenke takes these words as part of the next saying, to which they do not appear especially appropriate. The Valentinians did adapt Col. i. 16 and make of the Saviour 'the first universal creator' (cf. Exc. ex Theodoto 43 and 47; *The Gnostic Problem* 130f.), but it seems more natural to link the clause with the preceding sentence. Both for the Christian and for the Gnostic the life which is life indeed begins with the day Christ came.

100 19 (5) The world is
created, the cities adorned,
the dead carried out.

Whatever the punctuation, these lines seem to be an erratic block with no apparent connection either with the preceding or with the following 'sayings.' They appear to describe the life of this world, the activities of merely material men. If the 'Gentile' of line 15 does represent the ὑλικός, this may account for their presence, by some association of ideas. It may be noted, however, that despite their superficial lack of connection these opening 'sayings' do have a certain continuity of thought running through them. This whole page presents a series of contrasts: the slave and the son, the dead and the living, the Gentile and the man who has come to knowledge of the truth; in the following lines we have the contrasts of 'Hebrews' and 'Christians,' and summer and winter. There would seem to be similar links, if such they may be called, in other parts of the document.

100 21 (6) When we were
Hebrews, we were orphans and had
(only) our mother, but when we became
Christians we obtained a father and a mother.

As Grant observes (*J.B.L.* 79 (1960), 6), these lines are close to the Basilidian statement recorded by Irenaeus, that they were 'no longer Jews, but not yet Christians' (adv. Haer. i. 24 Massuet; trans. in Grant, *Gnosticism: An Anthology* 35); but the correspondence is not exact, since 'Philip' and his readers do claim to be Christians. What is clear is that the 'Hebrews' represent an earlier stage from which they have now emerged (cf. 110. 5–6). This *may* indicate a Jewish-Christian background at least for the author, which would in turn provide some confirmation for the view which traces the origins of Gnosticism to Jewish-Christian circles (cf. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*, Tournai 1958, 65; but see also Munck, N.T.S. vi (1960), 103ff.). On the other hand, it may be that the author has simply taken over Jewish-Christian material from some earlier source, and adapted it to his own purposes. It is perhaps relevant to recall the view of Burkitt, that Valentinus and others were Christians who sought 'to set forth the living essence of their Religion in a form uncontaminated by the Jewish envelope in which they had received it' (*Church and Gnosis*, Cambridge 1932, 27ff.). As Grant remarks (*J.B.L.* 10), the examples of Thomas and Philip 'show us that Christian Gnosticism, at any rate, could not easily free itself from its Jewish origins.'

The clue to the interpretation of these lines lies in the Valentinian theory: Sophia attempted to produce by herself, without her consort, and the result was a formless abortion; but from this the world derives, and all that is in it (Iren. i. 2, 3 Mass. (Grant, *Anthology* 166), Hippol. vi. 30). As a 'Hebrew,' as yet incomplete and without 'form,' the Gnostic was a child of Sophia only, 'weak and subject to the cosmic powers.' 'But when we have been formed by the Saviour (i.e. have become Christians), we have become children of a husband and a bride-chamber' (Exc. ex Theod. 68; cf. also 67, 79–80); cf. further Gärtner 254f. It may be worth noting that according to some Rabbinic statements non-Israelites have no father (Strack-Billerbeck iii. 353, cf. 65). The word ὀρφανός occurs

only twice in the New Testament, once in its normal sense (*Jam.* i. 27) and once metaphorically (*Jn.* xiv. 18; cf. *T.W.B.* v 487f.). On the latter passage W. L. Knox (*Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity*, London 1944, 79 n. 1) notes that Philo speaks of the whole Jewish nation as in a sense orphans (de Spec. Leg. iv. 179ff.); he finds here a philosophical commonplace, deriving ultimately from Plato (Phaedo 116a), which has passed through the medium of Hellenistic Jewish missionary propaganda to the Fourth Evangelist. The Eleven are described as 'orphans' in the Coptic Manichean Psalm-book (II. 187 line 12 Allberry, quoted by Puech in Hennecke-Schneemelcher i. 263).

100 25 (7) Those who sow in the winter reap in the summer.
The winter is the world, the summer the other aeon.
Let us sow in the world, that
we may reap in the summer. Because of this it is fitting
for us not to pray in the winter. What comes out of
the winter is the summer. But if any man reap
in winter, he will not reap but pluck out.

The key to these lines is provided by line 26 (cf. Hermas Sim. iii. 2, iv. 2). At an earlier stage in its history this 'saying' might have been understood in terms of the Jewish contrast of the two ages; it would then present a variation on the theme of 'treasure in heaven' (*Matt.* vi. 19f.; cf. the Talmudic story quoted by Plummer, *Exegetical Commentary on Matthew*, 106 n. 1). Here, however, it has been transmuted into a contrast between this material world and the spiritual world of the Pleroma (for αἰών = πλήρωμα cf. Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961, 56). 'Sowing' may perhaps refer to procreation [cf. for example Apoc. Joh. 63. 6 (Till, *T.U.* 60, 167; Grant, *Anthology* 81f.)]. Some Gnostic groups rejected marriage and procreation as merely multiplying the number of the souls in the power of the Demiurge, but the Valentinians took another view: for the psychic, continence was essential, but for the spiritual it was not necessary at all (cf. Iren. i. 6. 4 Mass.; Grant,

Anthol. 176). The reference to prayer presents some difficulty, since it is difficult to see any connection; but both Clement [Strom. vii. 41 (Prodicus)] and Origen (de Orat. v. 1) speak of Gnostics who rejected prayer, and reference may also be made to the Gospel of Thomas (log. 6 and 14). At 30f. Schenke reads 'If any man reap in winter, he will not reap (sc. in summer) but plough.' This seems to rest on a misunderstanding, since the Coptic word means 'pluck.' An attempt to reap in winter will not gather in a crop, but destroy it. For another use of the analogy of sowing and reaping cf. Heracleon fr. 32–36 (Grant, *Anthol.* 203f.).

100 32 (8) Like one of this kind he will produce fruit . . . . not only when he comes out . . . . but on the Sabbath also . . . . is without fruit.

Schenke restores as follows: 'According to [its greatness] will [anything] bring forth fruit. Not only does it (the fruit) come forth [daily], but on the Sabbath also [the power (sc. of growth)] is [not] without fruit.' Dr. Till, however, objects to this that the negative should follow *atkarpos* in the last line. His own suggestion is to take this 'saying' as a continuation of the preceding lines: 'since (ὡς) one of this kind will not produce any fruit. Not only will [the fruit] not come forth [during the week??], but on the Sabbath also [his field] is without fruit.' Any restoration must, however, remain largely conjectural.

100 35 (9) Christ came

101 to ransom some, to save others, to redeem others. Those who were strangers he ransomed and made his own. And he separated his own, those whom he set as pledges in his will. Not only when he appeared did he lay down the soul when he wished, but from the day the world came into

being he laid down the soul. At the time when he wished, then he came first to take it, since it had been left as a pledge. It was under the robbers and had been taken captive. But he saved it, and those who were good in the world he saved, and the evil.

This passage describes the work of Christ. The three verbs in 101. 1–2 seem to have much the same meaning, and certainly cannot be taken as referring to three classes of men (spiritual, psychic, hylic), since only the spiritual are destined to be saved. They must therefore relate to the Gnostics only, or to groups among them. 'Strangers' recalls the New Testament descriptions of Christians as 'strangers' and 'sojourners' (e.g. 1 *Pet.* i. 1, ii. 11; cf. *Phil.* iii. 20), but this conception also has undergone a transformation in Gnostic thought (cf. Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion*, Boston 1958, 49ff., 75ff.): the metaphor has hardened into a description of man's existential state. For the Gnostic, the soul essentially belongs to the spiritual world; here it is an alien, in bondage, the prisoner of matter, awaiting the Redeemer from above who brings the saving *gnosis*. In line 4 Dr. Till would read *nouhm* 'redeem' for 'separate,' but the last letter is not in the plate, although there is room for it. 'Separate,' however, would make sense, since it is a part of the Redeemer's work to isolate the 'spiritual' from the rest of men, in preparation for their final return to the higher world. Lines 6–9 are obscure: pledges 'in' his will or 'according to' his will? In line 8, again, Schenke emends to read 'in his will,' as in the preceding line. A further possibility, however, may perhaps be suggested for consideration: that this section is a Gnostic adaptation of *Jn.* x. 17–18: 'I have power to lay down my life (ψυχή), and I have power to take it again.' If Christ be considered pre-existent, and ψυχή in John be taken in the sense of 'soul,' not of 'life,' we have only to interpret τίθημι as meaning the depositing of souls in bodies to reach something very like the present passage. This would present a clear example of the 'Gnostic

Redeemer-myth,' not as one of the pre-suppositions of the Fourth Gospel but based on a re-interpretation of it. For knowledge of John cf. 105. 4–5.

12 *robbers:* the powers of the material world [cf. Sophia Jesu Christi 104. 12, 121. 16 (Till, *T.U.* 60, 249 and 283 and notes there); also Gärtner 180].

14 *and the evil:* we should expect 'the evil he condemned,' or some such phrase, but there is no gap in the text. Either something has been accidentally omitted, or perhaps we should interpret in terms of lines 20–21: the evil also will be 'saved' after their fashion, by being restored to their origin, when they will no longer be tormented by desire for the impossible [cf. Basilides ap. Hippol. vii. 27 (Grant, *Anthol.* 133)]. According to the Apocryphon of John, all souls will in the end be saved, albeit some by devious means and after further incarnations, except those who having once possessed *gnosis* have turned away [64. 14ff. (Till op. cit. 169ff.; Grant, *Anthol.* 82ff.)]; cf. Barn. v. 4 and 127. 14ff. below.

101 14 (10) The light and the darkness, life and death, the right and the left, are brothers one to another. It is not possible to separate them from one another. Because of this, neither are the good good, nor the evil evil, nor is life a life, nor death a death. Because of this each one will be resolved into its origin from the beginning. But those who are exalted above the world are indissoluble and eternal.

Schenke refers to 108. 26–28, where we find 'the good or the evil, the right and the left,' and 114. 11–13, which says 'their good (i.e. the good of this world) is not good, and their evil not evil.' According to Baynes (index, 221) the right and the left denote the spiritual and the material creations (cf. also Sagnard 544f.). Gärtner 115 n. 1 adds references to Iren. i. 5. 1, Exc. ex

Theodoto 37 and the Hypostastis of the Archons 143. 32ff. (Leipoldt-Schenke 77). These contrasts, of course, are also found in the New Testament (for 'death' and 'life' cf. Gärtner 169f.), but in Gnosticism these terms 'have taken their absolute contents from the decisive antithesis between the material world and the world of the aeons' (Gärtner loc. cit.; cf. also Jonas 57f.). The notable feature here is that these opposites are said to be 'brothers one to another.' This may perhaps recall the so-called 'Gnostic' passage in the *Qumran Manual of Discipline* (iii. 16–iv. 26), on the 'two spirits,' in which K. Schubert (*T.L.Z.* 78 (1953), 501ff.) found a *Syzygienlehre* pointing to contacts with Gnosticism; but cf. *Vig. Chr.* xi (1957), 106. More important perhaps are Schubert's references to similar pairs of opposites in the book Yetsirah (iv. 1, v. 2, vi. 2), and to the statement in Hag. 15a that for everything God made He made also a counterpart. The relation of all these sources to Iranian dualism is of course matter for debate. On the Qumran passage see most recently P. Wernberg-Møller in *Revue de Qumran* 11 (1961), 413ff.

Here, however, these 'opposites' appear to be contrasted not with each other but with 'those who are exalted above the world' (21ff.). In the light of 114. 11–13 it is therefore possible that the opposites refer to the illusory things of this world, which will be resolved into their origin [cf. the Gospel of Mary 7. 4–6 (Till, *T.U.* 60, 63; Grant, *Anthol.* 65)]. The passage would then serve as an explanation of 'the evil' in line 14, and as a transition to the following discussion of real and deceptive names (101. 23–102. 5).

101 23 (11) The names which are given
to worldly (things) contain a great
deception, for they separate their heart
from the things which are established to the things which are not established;
and he who hears (the word) 'God' does not
perceive (νοεῖν) him who is established, but he perceives

him who is not established. So also with the Father
and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and
life and light and resurrection
and the Church, and all the other names—
people do not perceive the things which are established, but they
perceive the things which are not established . . . they
have come to know what is established . . . . . .
they are in the world . . . .
102 [If the] . . . . . were in the aeon they would
not name any day in the world,
nor would they set them among worldly
things. They have an end in
the aeon.

'All the names given to worldly matters contain errors; they turn one's attention away from the permanent and toward the transitory . . . none of these terms (*in* 29*ff.*) can be understood properly without the Gnostic key to their meaning' (Grant, *J.B.L.* 7). Schenke refers to Exc. ex Theod. 31. 4.

worldly (*things*): κοσμικός (masc.). 'Things' has been added in the interest of the English style. The reference is to the entities denoted by the following names. 'The things which are established' is clumsy, but literal; it is meant to distinguish the Coptic plural from the singular of 28–29.

their heart: i.e. the hearts of men.

perceive: νοεῖν, which admits of several shades of meaning. In this context it is uniformly rendered 'perceive.'

Schenke restores: '[Those who] remove (*entfernen*) them (the names) from themselves are the established. Mortal men are in the world, [and go astray]. (102. 1) [If they] were in the aeon, they would not provide any day in the world with a name; nor would they have set them (Father, Son, etc.) among worldly things.' This, however, is not altogether satisfactory, particularly the first two sentences. In line 34 the two letters *HN* are visible before 'they,' and Dr. Till suggests the restoration πλήν. The problem then is to determine whether this is a continuation of the preceding sentence or, more probably,

a new sentence: Except they have come to know. . . . 'Mortal men' would make sense, but something more is needed to fill the gap. Schenke conjectures *nämlich*, but again Dr. Till's suggestion appears to meet the need more adequately: he proposes *rr[ome terou e]tmou* 'all mortal men are in the world.' The rest of line 36 is missing, and any restoration can only be conjectural. At 102. 1 a condition is suggested by the tense at the end of the line, but 'if they were' is hardly enough to fill the gap. A noun seems to be required as the subject. In lines 2 and 3, again, the verbs might be passives, and 'any day' not an object but adverbial—'at all.' If this is correct, the restoration might run: 'Except they have come to know what is established, all mortal men are in the world. . . . If the . . . were in the aeon, they would not be named at all in the world, nor would they be set among worldly things.' It is, of course, possible that the truth lies in a combination of these two reconstructions; another possibility, for example, might be to restore: 'all mortal men are in the world, and think of the things of the world. If they were in the aeon, they would not name any day in the world, nor would they set them (Father, Son, etc.) among worldly things'; but the state of the text precludes any certainty. The general sense, however, is clear: the names given in this world do not truly designate the beings of the higher sphere—in fact, they are a device of the hostile powers to deceive mankind (cf. 102. 18–31). Mortal men, except they receive the gift of *gnosis*, are therefore in error when they speak of 'God,' or of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Only the Gnostic knows the truth.

102 (12) One single name they do not utter in the world, the name which the Father gave to the Son, which is above all things, which is the name of the Father. For the Son would not become Father except he clothe himself with the name of the Father. This name those who have it know (νοεῖν) indeed, but they

do not speak of it. But those who have it not do not know it. But the truth brought forth names in the world for our sakes, since it is not possible to learn it without names. The truth is one and is many, and (that) for our sakes, to teach us this alone in love through many.

Dr. Schenke here refers to sayings 67, 69, 124 and to pl. 133. 12–16, 134. 12f., but a closer parallel than any of these is provided by the Gospel of Truth (38. 6–41. 3; Grant, *Anthol.* 158f.). The starting-point for such speculations is, of course, the Jewish conception of the *shem hammephoresh*, the ineffable name of God, and Quispel (*The Jung Codex*, London 1955, 68ff.) has stressed the importance of Jewish speculations in relation to this passage in the Gospel of Truth. See further Gärtner 122f.; Braun, *Jean le Théologien*, Paris 1959, 177ff., Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne*, Paris 1947, 650 (index s.v. *ὄνομα*). In the N.T., cf. Phil. ii. 9.

5 *they do not utter:* or (taking it as a passive) 'is not uttered.'

11 *know:* *νοεῖν* again, but here 'know' seems a better translation than 'perceive.' Dr. Schenke identifies those who have the name as the Father and the Son, and certainly they alone truly possess it as their own; but in view of 12f. it seems better to take the words as referring to the Gnostics who, like the Jews before them, know the Name but keep it secret. The unenlightened neither have nor know the Name.

13 *the truth:* cf. the range of meanings presented for *ἀληθεία* in Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*. A distinction is here drawn between the names given to worldly things (101. 23ff.), which are deceptive, and those produced by the truth, which are for man's instruction, to lead him to the truth.

102 18 (13) The archons wanted to deceive man, since they saw that he had a kinship with those that are truly good. They took the name of those that

are good and gave it to those that are not good, in order that by the names they might deceive him and bind them to those that are not good. And after, if they do them a favour, they will be made to remove from those that were not good, and set in those that are good, which they know. For they were wanting to take the free man and make him a slave to themselves for ever.

The theme of deception is now developed. It was the archons, the rulers of this world, who in their desire to enslave man were responsible for the deceptive names. The best commentary is perhaps the description of 'paradise' in the Apocryphon of John 55. 18ff. (Till, *T.U.* 60, 151f.; Grant, *Anthol.* 79f.). In the background once again is the Jewish conception of the jealousy of the angels after the creation of Adam. The word ἄρχων occurs fairly often in the New Testament, but there does not necessarily carry the Gnostic connotation although this is sometimes read into it.

24 *bind them:* Schenke understands 'men,' which is certainly the sense required, but after the immediately preceding singular this seems awkward. On the other hand, a reference to the names does not appear appropriate. Possibly there is a scribal error here, or perhaps a loose construction. Lines 25–29 are obscure, since it is not clear who 'they' are. In the following sentence the subject is clearly the archons. It is difficult to think of the archons causing men to remove from what is not good to the good (in the 'true' sense), nor is it clear who is doing favour to whom. Possibly the meaning is that if men show favour to the archons they will be made to remove from what is 'not good' to the 'good' (in the worldly sense) which is all they know. On 29–31 cf. Gal. iv. 8–9.

102 31 (14) There are powers which give . . . . . to man, without wishing to make him . . . . . in order that they may

do not speak of it. But those who have it not do not know it. But the truth brought forth names in the world for our sakes, since it is not possible to learn it without names. The truth is one and is many, and (that) for our sakes, to teach us this alone in love through many.

Dr. Schenke here refers to sayings 67, 69, 124 and to pl. 133. 12–16, 134. 12f., but a closer parallel than any of these is provided by the Gospel of Truth (38. 6–41. 3; Grant, *Anthol.* 158f.). The starting-point for such speculations is, of course, the Jewish conception of the *shem hammephoresh*, the ineffable name of God, and Quispel (*The Jung Codex*, London 1955, 68ff.) has stressed the importance of Jewish speculations in relation to this passage in the Gospel of Truth. See further Gärtner 122f.; Braun, *Jean le Théologien*, Paris 1959, 177ff., Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne*, Paris 1947, 650 (index s.v. ὄνομα). In the N.T., cf. Phil. ii. 9.

5 *they do not utter:* or (taking it as a passive) 'is not uttered.'

11 *know:* νοεῖν again, but here 'know' seems a better translation than 'perceive.' Dr. Schenke identifies those who have the name as the Father and the Son, and certainly they alone truly possess it as their own; but in view of 12f. it seems better to take the words as referring to the Gnostics who, like the Jews before them, know the Name but keep it secret. The unenlightened neither have nor know the Name.

13 *the truth:* cf. the range of meanings presented for ἀληθεία in Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*. A distinction is here drawn between the names given to worldly things (101. 23ff.), which are deceptive, and those produced by the truth, which are for man's instruction, to lead him to the truth.

102 18 (13) The archons wanted to deceive man, since they saw that he had a kinship with those that are truly good. They took the name of those that

are good and gave it to those that are not good, in order that by the names they might deceive him and bind them to those that are not good. And after, if they do them a favour, they will be made to remove from those that were not good, and set in those that are good, which they know. For they were wanting to take the free man and make him a slave to themselves for ever.

The theme of deception is now developed. It was the archons, the rulers of this world, who in their desire to enslave man were responsible for the deceptive names. The best commentary is perhaps the description of 'paradise' in the Apocryphon of John 55. 18ff. (Till, *T.U.* 60, 151f.; Grant, *Anthol.* 79f.). In the background once again is the Jewish conception of the jealousy of the angels after the creation of Adam. The word ἄρχων occurs fairly often in the New Testament, but there does not necessarily carry the Gnostic connotation although this is sometimes read into it.

24 *bind them:* Schenke understands 'men,' which is certainly the sense required, but after the immediately preceding singular this seems awkward. On the other hand, a reference to the names does not appear appropriate. Possibly there is a scribal error here, or perhaps a loose construction. Lines 25–29 are obscure, since it is not clear who 'they' are. In the following sentence the subject is clearly the archons. It is difficult to think of the archons causing men to remove from what is not good to the good (in the 'true' sense), nor is it clear who is doing favour to whom. Possibly the meaning is that if men show favour to the archons they will be made to remove from what is 'not good' to the 'good' (in the worldly sense) which is all they know. On 29–31 cf. Gal. iv. 8–9.

102 31 (14) There are powers which give ..... to man, without wishing to make him ..... in order that they may

become .... For if the man
.... sacrifices come into being
.... and offered up animals
103 to the powers ....
[These] are they to whom they offer up. They were indeed offering them while they were alive, but when they offered them they died. As for man, they offered him up to God dead, and he lived.

Dr. Schenke restores: 'There are powers which give [nourishment] to man, without wishing that he [eat], in order that they may become [the masters]. For if the man eats the [nourishment], sacrifices come into being. [They ate] and offered up animals to the powers in [the form of] wild beasts.' He suggests that it is probably a question of speculation based on Genesis 3. All that is certain is that the theme is the origin and nature of sacrifice, here ascribed to the influence of hostile powers. An interesting parallel is provided by Porphyry (de Abstin. 2. 40, 42), who speaks of the demons turning men to sacrifice 'because they wish to make us depart from the right knowledge of the gods and turn us to themselves. . . . For they wish to be gods' (cf. *The Gnostic Problem* 191 and notes there). Cf. Athenag. Apol. 26.

In 103. 2 'these' is Schenke's supplement to provide a subject, since this is lost in the lacuna in line 1; but it might have been a noun. This sentence and the next admit of various renderings: 'these are they to whom they make offerings' (or 'to whom offerings are brought'); 'they were indeed offered alive, but when they were offered they died.' The problem is to determine (*a*) who 'they' are at each occurrence; (*b*) whether the verbs should be translated literally or taken as passive; and (*c*) who lived and who died—the animals or the men who offered them. The simplest interpretation seems to be to understand the passage as a polemic against animal sacrifice, and adopt the alternative rendering above: the animals are alive when they are brought, but die when they are offered up. In contrast, man (according to a common Gnostic exegesis of

Gen. ii. 7) was lifeless until the Demiurge breathed the breath of life into his nostrils; or perhaps we should take it that man is dead in this mortal life, but when he attains to *gnosis* then he truly comes to life (cf. 100. 6ff. above).

103 6 (15) Before Christ came there was no bread
in the world, as in paradise, the place
where Adam was. There were many trees
for food for the beasts, but there was no wheat
for food for man. Man used
to feed like the beasts, but when Christ
came, the perfect man, he brought bread
from heaven in order that man might be nourished
with the food of man.

Dr. Schenke takes the opening words of line 6 as part of the previous saying, but Dr. Till considers them to belong to saying 15, pointing to lines 11f. The latter certainly makes better sense (cf. 100. 19 above). The present translation differs slightly from that of Schenke in points of detail, but the substance is the same. The saying seems to rest on a strictly literal interpretation of the Genesis creation story; according to Gen. ii. 8ff. the garden 'eastward in Eden' contained trees, but there is no reference to grain of any kind (cf., however, Gen. i. 29f.; but possibly the *βοτάνη* and *χόρτος* in LXX of this chapter were taken in the sense of 'grass, fodder,' i.e. exclusive of grain). The trees in Eden are a common theme for Gnostic speculation (cf. Grant, *Anthol.*, index 4). The reference to 'bread from heaven' recalls John vi. 31ff. (cf. also Exc. ex Theod. 13). Cf. also 108. 15–23, 111. 12–22.

In the *Life of Adam and Eve* it is said that after the Fall they had at first 'no victual such as they used to have in paradise' (*Vit. Adae et Evae* iii–iv; Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.* ii. 134 and notes). For Christ as 'the perfect man' cf. perhaps Eph. iv. 13.

103 14 (16) The archons
thought that it was by their own power and will

that they were doing what they did,
but the Holy Spirit in secret
was contriving everything through them
as it wished. Truth is sown
in every place, the truth which was from the beginning.
And many see it as it is sown.
But (only) a few who see it reap it.

Schenke refers to 'saying' 34, where the evil powers are said to be 'blind because of the Holy Spirit,' and to Iren. i. 5. 1, 3 (Grant, *Anthol.* 172f.), where Achamoth (also called the Mother, Sophia and Holy Spirit) is the real agent of creation, although the Demiurge thinks that he himself is alone responsible. The word translated 'everything' is the Gnostic technical term commonly rendered 'the All.'

19 *Truth is sown:* Schenke renders literally 'they sow the truth everywhere,' the reference being presumably to the archons operating under the secret influence of the Holy Spirit.

22 *reap:* 'are filled with it' Schenke; but Dr. Till observes that in the photograph the first letter of *hōs* is cancelled and written above the last, to produce ¯*sh* 'reap.' In any case the theme is a variant of 'Many are called, but few chosen.'

103 23 (17) Some said: Mary conceived of
the Holy Spirit. They are in error. What
they are saying they do not know. When
did a woman ever conceive of a woman?
Mary is the virgin whom no power
defiled, who is a great anathema
to the Hebrews, the apostles
and apostolic men.
This virgin whom no power
defiled . . . . the powers
defile them, and the Lord would not
have said 'My Father which [is] in heaven'
unless he had had another father,
but he said simply . . . .

Schenke construes lines 24f. differently: 'What shall one say

(to the contrary)? No-one knows when ever a woman conceived of a woman'; but the first verb is in the present tense (lit. 'what is that which they say'), and there seems to be nothing to correspond to his 'Was *soll* man sagen?' For the structure, Dr. Till refers to his *Kopt. Grammatik*, §355. The passage rejects the doctrine that Mary conceived by the Holy Ghost, on the ground that the Spirit itself is female (a view held by the Ophites and the Valentinians, and due in part to the fact that the Hebrew *ruah* is feminine). For the following lines Schenke refers to two passages in the Hypostasis of the Archons (Labib i, pl. 137. 11–31 and 139. 33–140. 3; German translation in Leipoldt-Schenke 73f. and 75. See also the *Nachtrag*, ib. 83, for further references). As he says, the theme of the seduction of Eve is variously employed in Gnostic mythology [cf. Iren. i. 30. 7, Hippol. v. 26. 23, Apoc. Joh. 62. 3ff. (Grant, *Anthol.* 55, 97, 81)]; but this is only the Gnostic version of a conception known to late Judaism and in other circles (op. cit. 83; cf. also Doresse, index s.v. Eve). Schenke's comment that Mary is probably thought of as an incarnation of the spiritual wife of Adam (cf. Labib pl. 137. 11–31) or as the wife of Seth may be valid in the context of Gnostic speculation, but it seems simpler to interpret in terms of the typology of Eve and Mary: Eve was seduced, whereas Mary remained immaculate [cf. for example Justin, Dial. 100; Iren. Dem. 33 and Froidevaux's note ad loc. (Sources chrétiennes 62, Paris 1959, 83ff.)]. At any rate this would appear to be the starting-point for such speculations. Doresse (30f., 218 n. 113) notes from Hippolytus a difference of opinion in the Valentinian school, which may be reflected in this passage: the 'Italians,' including Heracleon and Ptolemy, held that the body of Jesus was psychic, and that the Spirit descended upon him at the Baptism; the 'orientals' appealed to Lk. i. 35, and maintained that it was spiritual from the first. Philip would then appear to agree with the Italian school; but the passage may be an attack on more orthodox views. Kelly (*Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1958, 103, 144) notes that 'the all but unanimous exegetical tradition of Lk. i. 35' in the

pre-Nicene period identified the 'holy spirit' and the 'power of the Most High' not with the Spirit but with the Logos. Cf. also on 119. 3ff. below.

28 *anathema:* Schenke translates 'curse,' but the word is obscure. Nor is it easy, if this is the meaning, to see why Mary should be a curse to the 'Hebrews.' Possibly there is some echo here of the tumult among the Jews described in the Protevangelium of James xiiiff. (James, *Apoc. N.T.* 44f.). It is, however, interesting that the 'Hebrews' are immediately identified as 'the apostles and apostolic men.' Elsewhere (100. 21ff., 110. 5f.) the 'Hebrews' represent an earlier and less advanced stage from which the Gnostic has emerged, so that here he appears to be superior even to the apostles (cf. Carpocrates, Iren. i. 25; Grant, *Anthol.* 36); but other references are not necessarily disparaging (e.g. 110. 7). Grant (*J.B.L.* 8) notes that the word ἀποστολικός occurs in late second-century writers, but this can scarcely be used as a pointer to the date of the work; at the end of the century the word seems to be in sufficiently widespread use to suggest a fairly long history (for references see Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*).

32*ff.*: Schenke restores 'This virgin whom no power defiled revealed herself, that the powers might defile themselves. And the Lord [would] not [have] said 'My [Father who art] in heaven' unless [he] had had [another] father; but he would have said simply ['My Father']. Of this lines 34–35 are fairly certain, although it cannot be said whether it was the form of address which was quoted; the descriptive phrase is much more common in the Gospels. In line 36 a conditional is suggested by the context, but the Ms. has a simple perfect. The remainder of the reconstruction must be considered conjectural, and indeed it is possible that Dr. Schenke has here allowed himself to be unduly influenced by the passage in the Hypostasis referred to above (pl. 137. 11–31). Another myth depicts the seduction of the archons, who are thereby deprived of the light that is in them, by a beautiful woman (cf. Doresse, index s.v. Archons, Norea).

103 37 (18) The Lord said to the disciples . . . .
104 . . . . come into the house
of the Father, but do not receive (anything) in the
house of the Father and do not take (anything) away.

Schenke restores: 'The Lord said to the disciples: ['Ye children of the kingdom] come indeed into the house of the Father . . .".' For 'receive' Schenke has 'steal,' but to this Dr. Till demurs: 'steal' is *čiwe*, not *čiw*, and accordingly he divides the letters differently to read *mprči oude* 'do not receive nor again take anything away.' Grant (*J.B.L.* 5), following Schenke's version, comments that the saying 'seems to reflect John's mention of the Father's house (*Jn.* xiv. 2), combined with the synoptic version of the cleansing of the temple'; but this appears to go beyond the evidence.

104 3 (19) Jesus is
a hidden name, Christ is a revealed name.
Because of this Jesus on the one hand does not exist
in any other tongue, but his name is Jesus
as they call him. But Christ,
his name in the Syriac is the
Messiah, but in the Greek it is the Christ.
Altogether, all the others have it
according to the language of each one among them.
The Nazarene is the one that is revealed
in that which is hidden.

This is the first of three passages (cf. 110. 6–17; 111. 21–24) which find a deeper meaning in the names applied to Jesus. Grant drily remarks 'Though he may not be a Hebrew any more, the reader of Philip is expected to be concerned with the Hebrew and Syriac languages' (*J.B.L.* 6). 'Jesus' is said to be a 'hidden' name, apparently because it has no Greek equivalent, but must be transliterated, not translated. 'Christ' on the other hand is a 'revealed' name; the Hebrew 'Messiah' has its equivalent in the Greek 'Christos,' and also in other tongues. At 110.

6ff. (cf. Iren. Dem. 53) 'Jesus' is interpreted to mean 'salvation,' and 'Messiah' as meaning both 'Christ' and 'the measured' (for this Schenke refers to Brockelmann, *Lex. syr.* 406b). The name 'Nazarene' evidently caused some perplexity to the men of old, as to the modern scholars who have endeavoured to trace the origin and meaning of the various forms which occur (cf. *T.W.B.* iv. 879ff.; Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (1961), 67ff.). Here in 104. 12f. it is said to be 'the revealed in the hidden,' which may perhaps have some connection with the cryptic words of 'saying' 25 (105. 24–26). Schenke notes that this is based on a Hebrew etymology (*natsar:* hide. For this word Segal (*Concise Hebrew Dict.*, Tel Aviv 1938) lists the following meanings: watch, guard, keep; preserve; keep secret). At 110. 14 Nazara is said to mean 'the truth,' and Nazarene accordingly 'he that belongs to the truth' (the text has simply 'the truth,' but this seems to be the meaning required). On this Grant comments 'Since Nazara does not seem to mean "truth" in any human language, presumably this is a Gnostic secret—especially since a Valentinian formula reported by Irenaeus translates Jesus Nazaria as "savior of truth"' (*J.B.L.* 7; the reference to Iren. i. 21. 3 had already been noted by Schenke. On the formula Grant refers to Gressmann, *Z.N.W.* 16 (1915), 195). Here the forms Ναζωραῖος and Ναζαρηνός both occur in the same passage.

104 13 (20) The Christ has all things
in himself, whether man or angel
or mystery, and the Father.

Cf. 105. 28–106. 2, where it is said that Jesus revealed himself to the angels as an angel, and to men as a man. For 'mystery' cf. the Gospel of Truth 18. 15f. (an obscure passage which, however, brings the words 'hidden mystery' and the name 'Jesus Christ' together), 38. 19 (where the Name is the 'mystery' of the Invisible); also such passages as Colossians i. 25ff. For the Father, cf. John x. 30 and other passages dealing with the

relations of the Son and the Father. The whole 'saying' seems to be a summary statement of an early Christology, based on various New Testament passages which have still to be fully identified. The Letter to Rheginus (*Codex Jung* 44. 21–33) says the Son of God was also Son of Man, possessing both manhood and deity, in order that being Son of God he might vanquish death, and that the restoration into the Pleroma might take place through the Son of Man; which is a re-statement of the work of Christ in Gnostic terms. For the beginnings of Christological thought cf. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 138ff.

104 (21) Those who say that the Lord died first and then rose up are in error, for he rose up first and then died. If anyone does not first attain the resurrection, he will die. As God lives (?), this one would [die]

Cf. 121. 1–5. The clue to this curious statement seems to lie in the different meanings of the Greek words ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω, coupled with the idea that the Christian has already entered upon a new existence. The two verbs are commonly, but not exclusively, used with reference to the Resurrection. In Hebrews vii. 11, 15, for example, ἀνίστημι is used of the appointment of a high priest, while Acts iii. 22, quoting Deuteronomy xviii. 15, employs it of the raising up of a prophet like unto Moses; in Acts xiii. 22 ἐγείρω is used of the raising of David to the throne. In such passages as Acts iii. 26 (cf. *Beginnings* ad loc.) or xiii. 33 (cf. Lovestam, *Coni. Neotest.* xviii (1961), 8ff.), where the verb is used without the qualifying ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, the reference has been debated. Particular interest attaches in this connection to Acts v. 30: ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἤγειρεν Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ὑμεῖς διεχειρίσασθε κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου, and to xiii. 37. Acts v. 30 in itself might have given rise to the statement in this passage, but it is also possible that some formula using one of these

words in the sense of the appointment of Jesus (e.g. as the prophet like unto Moses) was interpreted as referring to the Resurrection. From Paul's doctrine of the new life in Christ (cf. for example *Col.* iii. 1) it was an easy step to the inference that for the Christian resurrection had already taken place (cf. 2 *Tim.* ii. 18; Doresse 301 n. 118); hence if a man did not attain to this resurrection in this life (i.e. become a Christian, or a Gnostic) he would lose the life eternal. And since Jesus as Redeemer anticipated, as it were, the journey of the soul, so he must have risen first. Eccentric as it may appear, the argument is not without a certain logic of its own; such examples help us to understand the exasperation of the Fathers at the Gnostic manipulation of Scripture.

19*f.*: the translation follows Schenke's conjecture, that the negative should be deleted in the apodosis; this seems necessary to the sense. Schenke, however, restores a negative in the next line: 'as God lives, this one will [not] die'; but this conjecture is more doubtful. There is a gap in this line, but while the verb is certainly *imperf. futuri* and might have been 'die' there does not seem to be sufficient room for the negative as well. Three possible lines of interpretation appear to be open: (*a*) to read as in the translation, and take 19f. as an emphatic re-iteration, backed by an oath; (*b*) to render 'such a man was about to die' (cf. Till, Gramm. §318, quoting *Jn.* iv. 47); or less probably (*c*) to understand 18f. as a rhetorical question, and 19f. as the emphatic reply. Cf. also 114. 7ff.

104 (22) No-one
will hide a great thing (πρᾶγμα) and precious
in a great thing, but many times
has one cast countless myriads
into a thing worth an assarion. So it is with
the soul. It is a precious thing, and came
to be in a despised body.

The translation is clumsy, but this is scarcely to be avoided

without paraphrase. 'Thing' represents in the first case the Greek *πρᾶγμα*, and in the other two occurrences the normal Coptic word. For the theme, cf. logion 29 of the Gospel of Thomas (pl. 86. 34–87. 2) and Paul's 'treasure in earthen vessels' (2 *Cor.* iv. 7, understood, of course, in Gnostic terms). Schenke compares 110. 17–26.

104 26 (23) Some
are afraid lest they rise naked.
Because of this they wish to rise
in the flesh, and they do not know that those who
bear the flesh [it is they who are] naked;
those who . . . . . . themselves to unclothe
themselves [it is they who are] not naked. 'Flesh
[and blood shall] not inherit the kingdom
[of God']. What is this which will
105 not inherit? This which we have. But what is
this which will inherit? That which belongs to Jesus
with his blood. Because of this he said:
He who shall not eat my flesh and drink
my blood has no life in him. What
is it? His flesh is the logos, and his blood
is the Holy Spirit. He who has received these
has food and drink and clothing.
For myself, I find fault with the others who say
that it will not rise. Then both of these
are at fault. Thou sayest
that the flesh will not rise; but tell me
what will rise, that we may
honour thee. Thou sayest the spirit in the flesh,
and it is also this light in the flesh. But
this too is a logos which is in the flesh, for whatever
thou shalt say thou sayest nothing outside the flesh.
It is necessary to rise in this flesh, in which
everything exists.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the author is frankly inconsistent here: in 104. 26–34 he seems to attack

the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, in 105. 9ff. to defend it. On line 27 Schenke aptly cites 2 Corinthians v. 3; lines 32–34 quote 1 Corinthians xv. 50 and 105. 4–7, as Puech (198) and Segelberg (196) note, present an exposition of John vi. 53ff. It is commonly said that the Gnostics denied the resurrection of the flesh, on the ground that the flesh (being material) was evil and could have no part in the world of the spirit; but Philip and the Treatise on the Resurrection addressed to Rheginus in the *Jung Codex* show that the situation is somewhat more complex. At 114. 3ff. the readers are warned neither to fear nor to love the flesh, but at 116. 34ff. (unfortunately fragmentary) a distinction is apparently drawn between the 'true' flesh and a flesh which is only an image of the true. 125. 2ff. declares that the holy man is holy even to his body. 'Rheginus' also seems to admit a resurrection of the flesh (*Codex Jung* 47. 4–8), but adds 'That which is better than the flesh is for it the cause of life,' and later says that 'incorruptibility descends upon the corruption, and the light flows down upon the darkness, to swallow it up' (48. 38–49. 4). Evidently these writers were grappling, not altogether successfully, with the Pauline doctrine as presented in the Corinthian epistles (in addition to the commentaries, cf. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, London 1904). For second-century ideas on the subject cf. Kelly 462ff. 2 Clem. 9, for example, insists that we shall in this flesh receive our reward, and Tertullian later deals with the question at length (cf. Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection*, London 1960). The Gospel of Thomas (log. 21, 37) presents the more normal Gnostic conception of a stripping off of the garment of the body (cf. *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas* 36f., Gärtner 184f., 250f.). Schenke further compares 'saying' 63 (114. 7–23).

The exposition of John vi. 53ff. forms the transition between the two parts of this 'saying,' and is possibly the link which connects them. The flesh and blood we now have will not inherit the Kingdom (104. 32ff.), but the flesh of Jesus is 'true flesh' and will inherit. This, however, would seem to raise

problems for the interpretation of the final sentences of the 'saying,' which assert the necessity of rising 'in this flesh, in which everything exists.' The Letter of James, however (*Jung Codex* 14. 35–36) makes Jesus say *after the Resurrection*: 'from now I shall unclothe myself in order that I may be clothed.' The idea may be that the Gnostic must rise in the flesh in order to be stripped of the garment of flesh and clothed in his heavenly robe; in which case 104. 26–34 may be an attack on those who maintain a resurrection of the flesh *and no more*, who are thus bound to the things of this world; and 105. 9ff. may be directed against the 'Greek' view that only the soul (or the spirit) is immortal. Both are wrong (105. 10f.). Cf. also Iren. i. 30 (Grant, *Anthol.* 58f.).

104. 30*ff.*: Dr. Schenke here restores 'those who bear the flesh represent a naked [death], those who [shall arise] to unclothe themselves [a death which is] not naked.'

105. 6*f.*: Ignatius (Trall. viii) identifies the 'flesh' with faith, the 'blood' with love. Cf. Ign. Rom. vii. 3.

105. 8 *food and drink and clothing:* Schenke renders 'food and drink in fulness,' but I have been unable to identify the final word in a form to produce this meaning. Dr. Till suggests that *hi bso* stands either for *hi sbo* 'and instruction,' or for *hi hbso* 'and clothing.' The latter appears the more probable, both as involving a slighter change and also because of Matthew vi. 25ff. He who has 'these' (logos and Holy Spirit) has all things needful.

10 *then:* the text has εἴτε, which Schenke renders 'on the other hand.' The translation assumes an original εἶτα which has been misread by the translator, or by a copyist.

105 19 (24) In this world those who put on garments are better than the garments. In the kingdom of heaven the garments are better than those who have put them on by water and fire, which purify the whole place.

Dr. Schenke takes 'in this world' as part of the preceding saying, and reads 'Those who put on the garments are chosen for the garments in the Kingdom of heaven'; but this does not seem to offer a very good sense. On Dr. Till's suggestion, adopted in the translation, we have a contrast between 'this world' and 'the kingdom,' and all falls into place. In Gnostic terms, the soul is more valuable than the body which is its garment (cf. 104. 20ff. above), but in the spiritual realm the heavenly robe is more valuable than the soul which puts it on after purification. 'Water' refers presumably to Baptism, and 'fire' to the chrism (cf. 27f.; possibly there is some connection with the καὶ πυρί of *Matt.* iii. 11, *Lk.* iii. 16); but cf. also Heracleon fr. 49 (Grant, *Anthol.* 207). For the idea of the heavenly garments Schenke refers to Bousset, *Hauptprobleme* 303 n. 2; cf. also Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, London 1951, 112f. and index s.v. Robe; Daniélou, *Théol. du judéo-christianisme* 381ff., for garments in relation to Baptism. The classic passage for the Heavenly Robe is, of course, the Hymn of the Soul in the Acts of Thomas. For 'fire' and chrism cf. also 115. 5.

105 24 (25) Those who are revealed through those who are revealed,
those who are hidden through those who are hidden. There
are some hidden through those who are revealed.
There is water in water, there is fire
in a chrism.

Schenke refers to 95. 20–24 (log. 83 of the Gospel of Thomas) and 104. 12f. Lines 24–26 are obscure, since there is nothing to indicate who or what 'those' are in each case. Some things evidently are revealed in what is visible (cf. perhaps *Rom.* i. 20); others are hidden in what is concealed (i.e. mysteries transmitted in secret; cf. Gärtner 109ff. and index s.v. Secret Doctrine); others again are hidden in what is visible. But here we are for the moment reduced to conjecture as to the meaning. For chrism cf. 1 John ii. 26f. and Dodd's note ad loc. (Moffatt Commentary 58ff.); also Lampe op. cit., index s.vv. Anointing,

Chrismation. For Philip chrism appears to have been a sacrament superior to Baptism (cf. 122. 12ff. and Segelberg 193f.).

105 28 (26) Jesus took them all by
stealth, for he did not reveal himself as
he [really] was, but he revealed himself
as they would be able to see
him . . . . he revealed
himself to them . . . . to
the great as great . . . .
little as little . . . . .
106 to angels as an angel, and
to men as a man. Because of this his
logos hid itself from every-one. Some
indeed saw him, while they thought they were seeing
themselves, but when he
appeared to his disciples in glory
on the mount he was not small. He
became great, but he made the disciples
great, that they might be able to see
him in his greatness. He said on that day
in the thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία): Thou who hast joined
the perfect, the light, with the Holy Spirit,
unite the angels with us also,
the images.

Schenke translates 'bore them all secretly' (*hat sie alle heimlich getragen*), and notes 'sc. his glories.' This immediately recalls Philippians ii. 5ff., but there are also other passages of similar import. A close parallel to 106. 1–2 is provided by the passage from the *Physiologus* quoted by Daniélou op. cit. 229 (cf. the whole section, ib. 228ff., for further references). Origen knew a tradition according to which Jesus was able to adapt himself to the individual viewer's powers of comprehension (Bauer in Hennecke-Schneemelcher i. 323; see refs. there). The Gospel of Truth (31. 4f.) speaks of the Son coming in 'a flesh of similitude,' the Gospel of Thomas (log. 28) of Jesus

'revealing' himself 'in flesh,' and on the basis of these and other texts Gärtner argues that 'the fact that Jesus revealed himself in *sarx* means that he took on a guise which could be apprehended by men, though the guise he took was not his own, but only an apparent body' (141ff.). If, however, Dr. Schenke's restoration of 116. 34ff. is correct, Gnostic subtlety has produced a further refinement: our flesh is not a 'true' flesh, but only an image of the true (cf. on 104. 26ff. above). The theme is in any case the mystery of the Incarnation, the humble estate assumed by the Son in his earthly life; cf. also 1 Corinthians ii. 8 and the idea of the 'Messianic secret,' and Barn. xii. 10.

The obvious reference for 106. 5ff. is the Transfiguration (Puech 198), but we may recall also other passages, particularly in Gnostic works, such as the Sophia Jesu Christi (77. 9–79. 9, Till, *T.U.* 60, 195ff.) or the Pistis Sophia (2–6; Schmidt-Till, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften*, 2nd ed., Berlin 1954, 3. 8–6. 5). The former of these two works is extant not only in the Berlin Codex but in a copy in the Nag Hammadi library (cf. Puech 168ff.). Cf. also Exc. 4. 1. A mountain is a common place for revelations of the risen Christ in Gnostic documents.

The saying ascribed to Jesus in 11ff. is, according to Grant (*J.B.L.* 6), 'entirely Valentinian,' and can be explained from the Excerpta ex Theodoto: 'It is the Christ-Aeon above who prays (Exc. 41. 2); the Light is the Savior Jesus (Exc. 35. 1), who is united with the Mother or Spirit (Exc. 64). The prayer is eschatologically directed: in Valentinian thought, the Gnostics, who were formed as images of the angels, will finally be united with the angels.' On the latter point he quotes Iren. i. 13. 6 and Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne* 418–419. Schenke quotes the first two passages from the Excerpta and Iren. i. 4. 1, 5. Cf. also i. 7. 1 (Grant, *Anthol.* 177). For 'image' and 'likeness' in the Gospel of Thomas cf. Gärtner 200ff., who cites the present passage on p. 206.

105. 32*ff.*: to fill the lacunae Dr. Schenke proposes 'to those who were in death (?) he revealed himself. He [revealed] himself to the great as great. He revealed [himself to] the small as

small. He [revealed himself] to the angels . . .' The general sense is almost certainly correct, but one cannot be quite sure of the details; at line 32, for example, Dr. Till suggests that the missing letters might have contained the subject of the preceding verb: 'as mortals would be able to see him.'

106 14 (27) Do not despise the lamb, for without it
it is not possible to see the king. No-one
will be able to enter in towards the king
if he is naked.

Segelberg (193) understands this rather enigmatic 'saying' in a baptismal context, and finds a reference to the putting on of Christ. This assumes an equation of 'being naked' and being 'without the lamb,' and also a combination of the Pauline metaphor of putting on Christ with John i. 29; which is possible, but perhaps scarcely to be regarded as certain. For a different interpretation of John i. 29 cf. Heracleon fr. 10 (Grant, *Anthol.* 197). Reference may also be made to log. 60 of the Gospel of Thomas, which contains another obscure reference to a lamb. The three passages, however, are probably quite independent. In lines 15f. some connection with Matthew xxii. 11f. is perhaps to be suspected; Matthew's 'wedding garment' may have been understood as referring to the resurrection body or the heavenly robe (cf. on 104. 26ff. above).

106 17 (28) The man of heaven, many are his sons
more than the man of earth. If the sons of
Adam are many, but nonetheless die,
how much more the sons of the perfect man,
they who do not die but are begotten
at all times.

Apparently a development of Paul's contrast between Christ and Adam (cf. *Rom.* v. 12ff., 1 *Cor.* xv. 45ff.). In spite of death, the sons of Adam (i.e. mortal men) are many; the sons of the

heavenly Man, however, do not die, but their numbers are continually being added to as each generation passes to eternity. The sense would be clearer if the Greek *καίτοιγε* in line 19 could be rendered, with Schenke, as 'although' ('although they die' for 'but nonetheless die'). Cf. also 2 Clem. ii. 3 and 107. 27ff. below.

106 22 (29) The father makes a son,
and the son has not the power to make
a son. For he who is begotten has not the power
to beget, but the son gets
for himself only brothers, not sons.

Schenke compares 99. 29ff., where the same Coptic verb is used (cf. note ad loc.). 'Get' and 'beget' render another Coptic word which is employed later (129. 19ff.) in a contrast between 'begetting' and 'creating.' Schenke gives the word the same force in both cases here and renders 'the child begets for himself neither brothers nor children,' but to this Dr. Till objects that the position of the negative shows that it refers only to the children. Possibly the meaning is that the Father produces a Son, but the Son does not himself beget; his work is to gain brothers who, like himself, are the children of God (cf. for example *Rom.* viii. 14ff., 1 *Jn.* iii. 1). This would provide some continuity with the preceding and the following 'sayings.' The 'sons of Adam' are begotten in this world, the sons of God are begotten of the Spirit. The latter, in Gnostic terms, are the children of the heavenly Anthropos.

106 26 (30) All who
are begotten in the world
are begotten of nature, and
the others of [the Spirit.] Those who are begotten
of him [cry out] there
to the man . . . . from the
promise because of the . . . . above.

The contrast here, if Schenke's conjecture is correct, is between natural and spiritual birth [cf. perhaps Heracleon fr. 46 (Grant, *Anthol.* 206f.)]. The lacunae at the foot of the page unfortunately preclude any certainty, but confirmation for the suggested 'cry out there (*or* thence)' in line 30 may perhaps be found in Hippol. v. 8. 15 (Grant, *Anthol.* 108). Schenke restores in 31f.: 'since they cry out on the basis of the promise with regard to the goal on high'; but other conjectures are possible: the word translated 'since they cry out' might be 'once, at one time' or 'they are nourished,' while of the Greek σκοπός ('goal') only the last three letters remain. Some support for one of these suggestions may perhaps be found in the occurrence of 'nourish' at 107. 1, but this is scarcely a sure foundation upon which to build.

106 33 (31) . . . . out of the mouth
. . . . the logos came forth thence
107 he would nourish . . . . from the mouth
and become perfect. For the perfect
conceive through a kiss and give birth. Because of this
we also kiss one another.
We receive conception from the grace which is
among us.

In each of the last two lines of pl. 106 almost half is missing, together with some letters in line 1 of pl. 107. Schenke restores: '[But he who] is [nourished] from the mouth . . . [if] the logos came forth there, he would be nourished(?) from the mouth and be perfect.' From line 2, however, the text is clearly legible. In a footnote Schenke suggests that by the 'perfect' the aeons may be meant, which is indeed very probable; but it is also possible that the term may refer to the true Gnostics. In his introduction (Leipoldt-Schenke 38) he writes: 'From sayings 31 and 55, in view of the depreciation which sexual relationships suffer in the Gospel of Philip, and in connection with the formulae in Iren. adv. Haer. i. 13. 2 and 3 (cf. Grant, *Anthol.* 191ff.; Schenke's reference to i. 18 appears

to be a misprint), which perhaps derive from the ritual of this sacrament, we may probably conclude that the heart of the mystery consisted in a holy kiss.' As Segelberg says (198), there is good reason to believe that he is right, at least in regarding the heart of the mystery as the holy kiss [but as Grant notes (*Vig. Chr.* 139) the evidence of Irenaeus seems to contradict Schenke's theory]. Whether it is correct to speak of a depreciation of sexual relationships in Philip is, however, another question. Three of Schenke's references (112. 35–113. 1; 117. 37–118. 1; 118. 29f.) are to passages where the manuscript is damaged, and the fourth (130. 4–7) says only that a normal human marriage is a private affair. If its intimacies are exposed to the sight of any outside a select few, it is not marriage but harlotry. According to Clement of Alexandria, the Valentinians were distinguished from other Gnostics by their warm approval of marriage (see Chadwick in *Alexandrian Christianity*, London 1954, 30f. and cf. Strom. iii. 1. 1); the sacred marriages of the aeons provided the model for earthly activity (Strom. iii. 29), and the Valentinian sacrament of the bridal chamber was in some sense a foretaste of the final bliss [cf. Exc. 63–64; Heracleon fr. 12, 38 (Grant, *Anthol.* 200, 204), Iren. i. 7. 1 (Grant, op. cit. 176f.); see also 113. 11f. below]. That marriage in this world should be called 'the marriage of uncleanness' (130. 4) means only that it is carnal in contrast with the spiritual marriages of the higher sphere. As Chadwick observes, the idea that defilement attaches to sexual relationships is old enough, and it figures in much ancient religion (cf. op. cit. 34). On the mystery of marriage in Philip cf. Grant, *Vig. Chr.* xv (1961), 129ff., who notes that the holy kiss was taken over from the Church (ib. 139, referring *inter alia* to *Rom.* xvi. 16, 1 *Pet.* v. 14, Justin Apol. I. 65. 2). Schenke cites Iren. i. 21. 3 (Grant, *Anthol.* 192) and Bousset, *Hauptprobleme* 315f.

107 6 (32) There were three who walked
with the Lord at all times, Mary his mother

and her sister and Magdalene,
whom they called his consort (κοινωνός).
For Mary was his sister and his mother
and his consort.

Schenke corrects 'her' to 'his' in line 8, presumably to agree with line 10; but cf. John xix. 25, Matthew xxvii. 55f., Mark xv. 40f. (on the problems of identification raised by these passages cf. Meyer and Bauer in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *N.T. Apokryphen i*, Tübingen 1959, 317f. (E.T., London 1963), and for another view Braun, *Jean le Théologien*, Paris 1959, 320ff.). Mary Magdalene is mentioned again at 111. 32ff. [as Schenke notes in his introduction (Leipoldt-Schenke 34 n. 4), she enjoys a privileged position also in the Pistis Sophia, in the Gospel of Mary (Till, *T.U.* 60, 63ff.; Grant, *Anthol.* 65ff.) and in the Gospel of Thomas (log. 114)]. The statement in both passages that she was the consort of Christ is plausibly explained by Schenke (op. cit. 34) on the basis of Valentinian theory, according to which there are three Christs: the aeon Christ as consort of the Holy Spirit in the Pleroma, the Saviour as consort of Sophia, and the earthly Jesus. It would be natural for them to assume that the latter also had a consort, and Mary is the obvious choice. A starting-point for such ideas is provided by John xi. 5: Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus. Grant notes (*Vig. Chr.* 138) that many early Christian and Gnostic writers were impressed by what they found in the Gospels about her; but his final remark, that 'she became spiritually pregnant and perfect,' is not expressly attested, as his reference would seem to suggest. It rests upon an inference from a combination of 111. 36 and 107. 2–4. The statement of line 10, that Mary was 'his sister and his mother and his consort' may rest on some Valentinian speculation, but may be simply a deduction from the names. The Virgin Mary and Mary Magdalene are sometimes confused (the Gospel of Mary has been ascribed to the Virgin by modern writers, in error), and according to Epiphanius one of Jesus' sisters was called

Mary (Haer. 78. 8, Ancor. 60; see Hennecke-Schneemelcher 312).

107 11 (33) The Father and the Son
are simple names; the Holy Spirit
is a double name. For they are
everywhere: they are above, they are below;
they are in secret, they are in the revealed.
The Holy Spirit is in the revelation,
it is below, it is in secret,
it is above.

'Father' and 'son' are 'simple' names, as consisting of one word only; 'Holy Spirit' is a double name, as consisting of two words. The whole cosmic order here seems to be subsumed under the four terms 'above,' 'below,' 'secret' and 'revealed': below are the visible things of this world, and above are the invisible things of the Pleroma.

15: lit. 'they are in what is hidden, they are in those that are revealed.' Schenke takes 'they' to refer to Father and Son, the Spirit being separately mentioned in 16ff.

107 18 (34) The saints are ministered unto
by the evil powers,
for they are blind because of the Holy Spirit,
that they may think they are serving
a man when they act for the
saints. Because of this a disciple
asked the Lord one day for something
of this world. He said to him:
Ask thy mother, and she will give thee
of that which is another's.

Schenke compares 103. 14ff. above, and notes that the Holy Spirit of line 20 is the equivalent of 'the Mother' in line 26. Both titles are given to Achamoth in Valentinianism. Cf. also the Gospel of the Hebrews as quoted by Origen (Comm. in Joh. ii. 12) and Jerome (in Jes. xi. 2, 9; see James, *Apoc. N.T.* 2,

5; Hennecke-Schneemelcher 107f.). Puech (198) notes in 23–27 an uncanonical saying of Jesus.

27 *that which is another's:* ἀλλότριον, possibly in the sense of 'alien.' The Gnostic does not belong in this world, and all that is in it is alien to him.

107 27 (35) The apostles said
to the disciples: May our
whole offering obtain salt.
They called . . . . . . salt. Without it
no offering is acceptable.

Dr. Schenke here emends *hmou* into *hmot*, and translates: 'May our whole offering obtain grace. They cried [to Christ], in order to receive grace without it. May the offering [be prepared] when it (i.e. grace) is received.' To this, however, Dr. Till objects that *hmou* occurs three times in the context (lines 29, 30, 34). 'Grace' would certainly make sense, while 'salt' at first sight is perplexing; but it is not likely that the same error would be made three times in half a dozen lines. The clue is perhaps to be found in the prescription of Leviticus ii. 13 that every sacrifice is to be seasoned with salt (cf. the addition in *Mk*. ix. 49 in D, some Old Latin and some Bohairic Mss.; also *Col*. iv. 6). Something (unfortunately there is a lacuna here) is called salt, and without it no offering is acceptable. 'It' in line 30 is feminine, so that the missing noun to which it refers must also be feminine; both *hmou* and *hmot* are masculine. Any conjecture must of course be hazardous, but there appear to be grounds for thinking that it would not be altogether fanciful to suggest supplying 'Sophia.' In the first place, the trace which remains of the last letter might belong to an *a*; secondly, *hmou* occurs both before and after the reference to Sophia in line 32, which suggests that the two sections (27–31 and 31–108. 1) may have been more closely connected; thirdly, there is a link between salt and barrenness. Salt land was 'emblematic of barrenness and desolation' (*H.D.B.* iv. 355,

citing *Deut*. xxix. 23, *Jer*. xvii. 6, *Zeph*. ii. 9), and we read of captured cities being destroyed and their sites sown with salt (e.g. *Jud*. ix. 45, quoted *H.D.B.* loc. cit.). Finally, there is a proverbial connection between salt and wisdom (cf. Hastings, *Dict. Apost. Church* ii. 442, Peake in *Exp. Gk. Testament* on *Col*. iv. 6). On this basis it is possible to trace a fairly clear association of ideas, even if the exegesis involved seems strange by modern standards: the reference to 'salt' in line 29 prompts the author to two comments, first that wisdom was called 'salt,' and without this saving grace no offering is acceptable; and second, with a shift of meaning from 'wisdom' to Sophia and from 'salt' to the barrenness it symbolized, that the barren woman of Is. liv. 1 (cf. *Gal*. iv. 27) represents Sophia.

107 31 (36) But
Sophia is barren, without child. Because
of this she is called . . . .
salt. The place where they . . . .
35 in their way the Holy Spirit . . . .
108 . . . . . many are her children.

Dr. Schenke's restoration is: 'But Sophia is a barren (woman) [who] (yet) [has] children. That is why [she] is called ['She who] gives your grace to drink.' The place [where] they are to [drink, in order to] become pregnant in their fashion [is] the Holy Spirit. [That is why] her children are many.' He compares 111. 30–32 and 'saying' 31 above. Against this it has already been observed that the word emended into 'grace' occurs thrice in this context. Moreover there is no reference to drinking in either of the passages cited, although the 'nourishment from the mouth' of 107. 1 might suggest it; but the text there is by no means certain. Possibly Schenke has in mind log. 108 of the Gospel of Thomas. The translation of line 32 here given rests on a restoration suggested by Dr. Till. For line 33 he conjectures, with some hesitation, 'Because of this she is called [birthless].' The chief objection to this is that

it would leave at the end of the line the four letters *pein*, which do not seem to fit in any way with *hmou* at the beginning of line 34 (Schenke apparently reads *petn*). For the remainder of the latter line Till proposes 'The place where they will become as they were before,' which would adequately fill the gap. The lacunae, however, are such as to make any restoration highly precarious. One might, for example, be tempted to supply 'pillar of salt' (on the basis of *Gen.* xix. 26), and assume that Lot's wife was taken as a 'type' of Sophia; but there is no word of this meaning which would fit the gap.

It may be noted that Isaiah liv. 1 (see previous note ad fin.) is quoted in 2 Clem. ii with reference to the Church, which was barren before children were given to her (cf. also Iren. Dem. 94). Now in Ephesians v. 25ff. (cf. 2 Clem. xiv) the Church is the Bride of Christ, as in Valentinian theory Sophia is destined to be the bride of the Saviour. Daniélou (337f.; cf. the whole section 317f.) rejects the arguments of Schlier and others for the existence of a 'Sophia ecclesiology,' but admits an assimilation of the Church and Sophia; this doctrine, he says, is properly Gnostic, a distortion of the Jewish-Christian doctrine, and appears both in Theodotus and in Ptolemy (cf. further Sagnard index s. v. Ἐκκλησία). This would seem to add some confirmation to the suggestions of the previous note, and to indicate that the key to this passage is to be sought in speculations of this kind.

108 (37) What the father possesses belongs to the son, and he also, the son, so long as he is small is not entrusted with what is his. But when he becomes a man his father gives him all that he possesses.

Schenke refers to 'saying' 2, with its contrast of slave and son, and to Galatians iv. 1f., which appears to lie behind this passage. The terms 'father' and 'son' are used quite generally

here, and not with specific reference to the Father and the Son. Rather does the 'son' represent the Gnostic, who in this life is among the 'lost,' but when he attains to maturity will be master of all.

108 6 (38) They that are lost whom the Spirit begets, they also go astray through it. Because of this, by this one breath the fire blazes and is put out.

Schenke translates 'The lost are those whom the Spirit begets. Through it also one goes astray.' The sense seems to be that the Spirit both produces and also leads astray, just as a wind may either blow a fire into a blaze or put it out. In most cases in this text the Greek διὰ τοῦτο or its equivalent appears to refer to what precedes, but here it seems to refer to what follows: the wind provides an illustration of the working of the Spirit. Schenke compares lines 28–34.

108 10 (39) Echamoth is one thing and Echmoth another. Echamoth is simply Sophia, but Echmoth the Sophia of death .... (dittog.), which is the one which knows death, which is called the little Sophia.

This passage appears to contain a scribal error in lines 12f. After 'the Sophia of death' the scribe continued *ete taei te* but then, instead of writing *etsooun mpmou*, repeated *tsophia mpmou*; he then wrote the phrase in its proper form. The words 'which is the Sophia of death' have accordingly been deleted from the translation.

There does not appear to be any parallel for the description of the lower Sophia as 'the Sophia of death,' but Schenke notes that in Irenaeus (i. 21. 5; Grant, *Anthol.* 194) the higher Sophia, in contrast, is called ἄφθαρτος. The designation 'Sophia of death'

may, however, derive from the fact that it was Sophia-Achamoth who 'brought death into the world and all our woe,' since before her separation from the higher Sophia, and the cosmic process thereby set in train, there was only the perfect spiritual world of the Pleroma. In the account of Valentinianism supplied by Irenaeus the name Achamoth is given only to the lower Sophia; it is therefore not without interest that here it is applied to both, although with a difference of vocalization. Ultimately it derives from the Hebrew *hochmah* 'wisdom,' and there is no reason why it should not have been given to both. Grant (*J.B.L.* 7) suggests a link with the Hebrew *moth* 'death,' and notes 'The expression "the little Sophia" seems to arise from an environment where Judaism and Gnosticism met.' The question is whether such phenomena point to an older Jewish 'Gnosticism,' to the influence of Jewish speculation on the Gnostics, or to purely Gnostic speculation based on a somewhat superficial knowledge of the Hebrew language and of Jewish ideas. Puech (199) links the 'Sophia of death' here with the 'ἐνθύμησις of death' in Manicheism (cf. Schmidt-Polotsky, S.B. Berlin 1933, 78–80; Polotsky, *P.W.* Suppt. VI, 1934, col. 254, 1–18) and the 'ἐπιθυμία of death' in the Apocryphon of John (57. 4f. Till; Grant, *Anthol.* 80).

108 (40) There are animals which are subject to man, like the bull and the ass and others of this kind. There are others which are not subject and live apart in the deserts. Man ploughs the field by means of the beasts which are subject and from this he feeds himself and the beasts, whether those which are subject or those which are not subject. So is it with the perfect man. Through powers which are subject he ploughs, preparing for everything to come into being. For because of this the whole place

stands, whether the good or the evil,
and the right and the left. The Holy Spirit
tends everything and rules all
the powers which are subject
and those which are not subject, with those which are separate.
For indeed it . . . . include them
in order that . . . .
. . . .

The relation between earthly man and the animals, wild or tame, serves as an illustration of the government of the universe by the Gnostic Anthropos, apparently identified in line 28 with the Holy Spirit. For 'the perfect Man' cf. Apoc. Joh. 22. 9, 16, and for the Holy Spirit as the supreme Being ib. 22. 19ff. (Grant, *Anthol.* 70); the relation between this kind of speculation and that which identifies the Spirit with Sophia is not altogether clear. With lines 19–23 Schenke compares 112. 20–22; on 'good and evil, right and left' (27f.) he refers to 'saying' 10, on lines 28–31 to 'saying' 38 above. 'The whole place' in line 26 is the entire cosmos. For the lacuna in lines 32ff. he supplies: 'For it reveals itself [in order to] include them, in order that [they may not know] their passions (any more) and no longer be powerful.'

108 34 (41) . . . . . moulded him . . . . .
. . . . . thou wouldst find his sons
109 noble creations (πλάσμα). But if he was not
moulded but begotten, thou wouldst
find that his seed was noble. But
now he was moulded and begot. What
nobility is this?

Schenke restores: '[If Adam had been] moulded, [thou wouldst perceive and] find that his sons were (likewise) noble creatures.' Some details are uncertain, but the passage is clearly a speculation based on Genesis ii. 7 (ἔπλασεν: for πλάσσειν and πλάσμα used with reference to the formation of Adam cf. Apoc.

Joh. 48. 16–17 Till; Grant (*Anthol.* 78) translates 'formed a formation'). On Dr. Schenke's division of the 'sayings' the point would seem to lie in 109. 4: if Adam was 'formed,' one would expect his sons also to be 'formations'; if he was begotten, they too would be begotten (cf. the discussion of 'creating' and 'begetting' in 120. 14ff.); like should follow like. In fact, however, although Adam was 'formed' his sons were begotten. The difficulty with this interpretation is that it gives no place to 'noble' and 'nobility.' It may be, therefore, that 'sayings' 41 and 42 belong more closely together: had Adam been formed (by the hands of God, as in Genesis) or begotten (by some deity, as in other mythologies of man's origin), one would expect some sign of nobility in his children. But what are the facts? First adultery, then murder. The objection that 'adultery' refers to the seduction of Eve may be met by the observation that according to Genesis she was created from the side of Adam, and may therefore be regarded as in a sense his child.

109 (42) Adultery came into being first, afterwards murder; and he was begotten in adultery, for he was the son of the serpent. Because of this he became a murderer, even as his father also. And he slew his brother. But every association which came into being between those unlike one another is adultery.

As Grant observes, here we find an allusion to the old Gnostic myth that Ialdabaoth actually seduced Eve and was the father of Cain (*Vig. Chr.* 135; for references cf. note on 103. 23ff. above; Grant cites Hippol. v. 26. 22–23; Epiph. xxxvii. 4. 4–5, xl. 5. 3). This myth goes back into Jewish speculation, although there is possibly room for debate as to whether Grant is right in seeing 'a more allegorical version' in 2 Corinthians xi. 3. Schenke refers to 118. 20ff., and notes that

for the Valentinians the Devil, the Demiurge and Achamoth (Iren. i. 5. 4) correspond to Cain, Abel and Seth (ib. i. 7. 5; cf. Grant, *Anthol.* 173f., 178). In point of fact, Cain is very variously estimated by different Gnostic groups: some carried their hostility to the God of the Old Testament to the point of venerating the serpent, Cain and others who in the Old Testament are accursed; in the Hypostasis of the Archons (Labib pl. 139. 12ff.; German trans. in Leipoldt-Schenke 74) he and Abel are apparently born normally of Adam and Eve; in the Apocryphon of John (62. 8–63. 2 Till; Grant, *Anthol.* 81) they are the offspring of Ialdabaoth. Seth, on the other hand, was 'well suited to become the great prophet of the Gnostic race' (Doresse 39 n. 97; cf. index s. v.), and plays a central role in the speculations of the Sethian sect, to which the Nag Hammadi library apparently belonged.

6 *murder:* or perhaps 'the murderer' (so Schenke, Grant). The latter would fit better with the following words, but after 'adultery' one expects another crime, not the criminal, and 'murder' is the meaning given for *hotbe* in Crum's Dictionary.

9 *a murderer, even as his father also:* Schenke here cites Iren. i. 30. 9 and John viii. 44. Cf. also 1 John iii. 8–15. In the next line the word rendered 'association' is κοινωνία.

109 12 (43) God is
a dyer. As the good dyes,
which are called genuine, die
with the things which are dyed in them,
so with those that God has dyed. Since
his dyes are immortal, they are
immortal through his colours.
But God dips (βαπτίζειν) what he dips
in water.

Schenke refers to 111. 25–30, a passage which in some respects recalls the story in some Mss. of the Infancy Gospel of Thomas (James, *Apoc. N.T.* 66f.). Segelberg (192) finds here a pointer to the central action in the rite of Baptism,

which he thinks was probably total immersion. The verb translated 'dips' in line 19 is in both cases *βαπτίζειν*, but at the second occurrence Schenke emends to *βάπτειν*. In line 18 there seems to be a play on the different meanings of the Coptic *pahre*, which may be an equivalent of the Greek *φάρμακον* or mean 'paint, colour.' The reasoning may be somewhat tortuous, but the sense is fairly clear: good dyes last as long as the materials they are used to dye; God's dyes, however, are immortal, therefore whatever is dipped in them (i.e. those who are baptized) is likewise immortal.

109 (44) It is not possible
for any to see anything of those that are established
unless he becomes like them.
Not as with man when he is
in the world: he sees the sun, but is not
a sun; and he sees the heaven and the earth and
all other things, but he is not these—
so is it with the truth. But thou didst
see something of that place and thou
didst become these: Thou didst see the Spirit,
thou didst become spirit. Thou didst see Christ, thou didst
become Christ. Thou didst see the Father, thou shalt
become Father. Because of this, [here] thou seest
everything and [dost not see] thyself.
But thou seest thyself [in that place]. For what
thou seest thou shalt [become].

For 'those that are established' Schenke has the singular (probably as the more natural modern usage) and refers to 'saying' 11; in both passages the Coptic word is in the plural and refers, as these sayings show, to the things (or beings) of the spiritual world. On this passage as a whole Schenke refers to 'saying' 113, which works out more elaborately the theme that like must mix with like, already briefly stated in another form in 109. 10–12 above. Cf. in the New Testament 1 John iii. 2. On the natural level a man sees, but remains distinct from the things that he sees; in the spiritual realm, on the contrary, a

man is united with God by the vision of Him (cf. Kirk, *The Vision of God*, London 1932). In this case the lacunae may be restored with some confidence.

109 36 (45) Faith receives, love gives . . . . .

110 . . . . . without faith. No-one will be able to give without love. Because of this, that we may receive we believe, but in order that we may give in truth, since if anyone does not give in love he has no profit from what he has given.

Here the lacunae are more difficult to fill. Schenke restores: 'Faith receives love. It gives [nothing] without faith'; which would make sense, but cannot be regarded as certain. In lines 2–3 something appears to have been omitted. Schenke inserts a clause after 'because of this,' but the position of the μέν and δέ suggests that the missing words came later: 'in order that we may receive, on the one hand, we believe; but in order that we may give . . .' (Dr. Till suggests something like 'we must love'). There is no gap in the text, so that the omission must be placed to the account of a copyist. Here two of the three cardinal graces of 1 Corinthians xiii. 13 appear together, and the statement of lines 4–5 might have come straight out of the New Testament itself.

110 5 (46) He who has not received the Lord is still a Hebrew.

For 'Hebrews' cf. 100. 21f., 103. 29f. above.

110 6 (47) The apostles who were before us called (him) thus: Jesus the Nazorean, the Messiah, that is, Jesus the Nazorean, the Christ. The last name is Christ, the first is Jesus, that in the midst is the Nazarene. Messiah has two meanings, both Christ and

the measured. Jesus in Hebrew is the redemption. Nazara is the truth. The Nazarene accordingly is the truth. Christ is measured. The Nazarene and Jesus are they who have been measured.

Schenke refers to 104. 3–13 and 111. 21–24, which are also concerned with the significance of the names applied to Jesus. For the apostles, cf. 103. 29, 107. 27, 121. 8 and especially 122. 16–18, which in conjunction with the present passage shows that Philip claims to stand in the apostolic tradition. As Grant says, however, this does not prove the document anything but Valentinian, since the Valentinians also claimed a tradition handed down from the apostles (*J.B.L.* 8). The phrase 'the apostles who were before us' is adapted from Galatians i. 17. For the significance found in the names see the note on 104. 3–13. As noted there, the text in line 15 reads 'The Nazarene accordingly is the truth,' but the meaning required appears to be 'he that belongs to the truth.'

110 17 (48) When the pearl is cast down in the mud it does not become dishonoured the more, nor if it is anointed with balsam oil will it become more precious. But it has its worth in the eyes of its owner at all times. So with the sons of God wherever they may be. For they have the value in the eyes of their Father.

Schenke refers to 104. 20–26, where the soul is compared to something precious placed in a worthless container. The analogy of gold in mud is mentioned in Irenaeus' account of the system of Ptolemy (i. 6. 2; Grant, *Anthol.* 176). Whatever he may do, or whatever may befall him, the Gnostic cannot lose his spiritual nature. In 18f. the word 'become' has been

written twice in error. Cf. also Plotinus Enn. i. 6. 5 ad fin. in MacKenna's translation.

110 26 (49) If thou sayest 'I am a Jew,' no-one will be moved. If thou sayest 'I am a Roman,' no-one will be disturbed. If thou sayest, 'I am a Greek, a barbarian, a slave, a free man,' no-one will be troubled. If thou sayest 'I am a Christian' . . . . will tremble. May it be . . . . this fashion. This one who . . . . cannot endure . . . . name.

The text is damaged from line 28, but the lacunae in lines 28–31 may be restored with confidence. For the remainder Dr. Schenke proposes: 'If thou sayest "I am a Christian," [every-one] will tremble. May it be that I [receive] this sign which [the archons] will not be able to endure, [namely] the Name.' This involves reading *maeine* for *meine* in line 33. The emendation is accepted by Segelberg (194), who suggests a connection with some ceremony either at the Baptism or at the chrism when the name was given. Schenke suggests that the names are thought of as pronounced in the presence of the archons during the ascent of the soul into the kingdom of light (cf. the Gospel of Mary 15–17. 7 Till; Grant, *Anthol.* 67); but it is not necessary to limit their possible use in this way. Perhaps the passage reflects a period when Christians had begun to be persecuted 'for the name'; at any rate they are thought of as standing apart from other people (cf. the 'third race'; see e.g. Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity* i. 300ff.). In favour of Schenke's restoration it may be noted that *maeine* is masculine, whereas *meine* is feminine; the former would therefore fit better with the following *paei*, which is also masculine. The reconstruction is, however, by no means certain. 'Every-one' may probably be accepted

in line 32, but for the remainder Dr. Till suggests 'May it be that I [may receive this] in this fashion. This one who . . . cannot endure [hearing] this name.' Here again, therefore, any restoration must be regarded as purely conjectural. For 'Jew or Greek, bond or free' cf. 1 Corinthians xii. 13, Galatians iii. 28; 'barbarian' occurs in a similar list in Colossians iii. 11. For 'tremble' cf. Exc. 77. 3.

110 35 (50) God is a
111 man-eater. Because of this they slay the man
for him. Before they slew the man
they were slaying the beasts. For no gods
were they for whom they slew.

Cf. 102. 31ff., which appears to contain a polemic against animal sacrifice (see note there). Here the curious statement that 'God is a man-eater' is explained by what follows: the purpose of human sacrifice is to provide food for the gods. From such passages as Genesis xxii and Exodus xiii it might be argued (in contrast to the statement in 111. 2–3 that animal sacrifice preceded human) that animal sacrifice was in fact later, the animals being regarded as substitutes for the human victim; but according to Moore (*Enc. Bib.* col. 4192) 'it does not appear that human sacrifices were frequent in the early centuries of the Israelite occupation of Canaan.' In his view, the offering by parents of their children, of which there is so much in the prophets and laws of the seventh century, was 'not the recrudescence of ancient custom, but a new and foreign cult.' It is probably adventurous to suggest that Philip here preserves an echo of Israelite reaction against the innovation, but whatever its history and antecedents the passage clearly rejects sacrifice. Those for whom the victims were slain were no gods (cf. 1 *Cor.* viii. 4–5, x. 20; *Gal.* iv. 8). See also 121. 19ff. below.

111 5 (51) Vessels of glass and vessels of earthenware are made by means of fire. But if vessels of glass are broken they are made again, for they are brought into being by a breath. But vessels of earthenware, if they break, are destroyed, for they come into being without breath.

For 'vessels' cf. the Gospel of Truth 25. 28ff., 26. 10, where the editors suggest a possible recollection of Romans ix. 20–24 and 2 Timothy ii. 20–21. In the present passage a contrast is drawn between glassware and earthenware: fire is employed in the making of both, but vessels of glass are 'blown' and if broken can be melted down and blown again, whereas earthenware vessels, once broken, cannot be remade. The 'breath' (πνεῦμα) of the blowing would of course represent the spirit, so that the glass vessels stand for the Gnostics. Earthenware vessels represent the merely material man, the more appropriately in that they are moulded on the potter's wheel and blowing does not enter into their manufacture. Schenke compares 112. 5ff., where another analogy is used.

111 11 (52) An ass which turns a mill-stone did a hundred miles walking. When it was loosed, it found that it was still at the same place. There are men who make many journeys, but make no progress anywhere. When evening came for them, they saw neither city nor village, neither creation nor nature, power and angel. In vain did the wretches labour.

The text in line 12 has simply 'a stone,' but the qualifying *nnout* (i.e. mill-stone) has been added later above. Segelberg (196) suggests that this passage 'might be a criticism of the eucharistic practices of the Church,' and renders 'Men too

walk long distances but do not get anywhere' (15–17) and 'In vain have these miserable men taken trouble over the Eucharist' (20–21). This interpretation is certainly valid in that the passage is a condemnation of unproductive effort, but whether it refers specifically to the eucharist is another question. Dr. Till observes that the Greek loan-word εὐχαριστία here has no syntactic connection with the preceding words, and moreover this rendering (following Schenke) does not take any account of the following *pe*. The position of γάρ in line 22 suggests a different division of the sentences: *teucharistia pe is̄. eumoute gar erof*—'The eucharist is Jesus. For he is called. . . .' If this be correct, the criticism is not directed specifically at the eucharistic practices of the Church, but is more general. It is not only frequency of communion without true spiritual quality that marks 'a donkey-Church' (to use a phrase of Segelberg's which merits pondering). We may perhaps recall the barren fig-tree in our Gospels.

111 21 (53) The eucharist (εὐχαριστία) is Jesus. For he is
called in the Syrian Pharisatha,
which is 'the spread out.'
For Jesus came crucifying the world.

If the view suggested in the preceding note is correct, these lines present a curious play on the meanings of words. Schenke notes a Syriac root *prs* with the meaning 'spread out'; Segal (*Concise Hebrew-English Dictionary*, Tel Aviv 1938) gives a cognate Hebrew word with the two meanings 'break (bread)' and 'spread.' This would serve to explain the identification of Jesus and the eucharist, quite apart from anything else. But 'spread out' also suggests extending upon the Cross. In line 24 Schenke translates 'For Jesus came and was crucified for the world,' but Dr. Till objects that to his knowledge the word never has a passive meaning, and quotes Galatians vi. 14. In Gnostic thought the redemption is effected not by the Passion but by the imparting of *gnosis* (although such

texts as the Gospel of Truth do show that some place was given to the death of Christ by certain Gnostics); 'crucifying' the world means presumably revealing its true character and worthlessness [but cf. the passage quoted by Puech 184 from the Book of Jeu (Schmidt-Till, *Kopt.-gnost. Schriften*, Berlin 1954, 257. 17ff.)]. On this line of interpretation a closer connection between these 'sayings' begins to emerge: 51 contrasts the 'spiritual' and the merely 'material'; 52 presents the futility of effort on the merely material level; and 53 culminates in the 'crucifixion' of the world. For the 'exposition' of the names of Jesus Schenke compares 104. 3–13, 110. 6–17.

(54) The Lord went into the dye-works
of Levi. He took seventy-two colours
and threw them into the vat. He took them
out all white. And he said: Even so
came the Son of
†the Son of †Man . . . .

Schenke refers to 109. 12–20 above, where God is said to be a dyer. In some respects the present passage recalls the story in some Mss. of the Infancy Gospel of Thomas (James, *Apoc. N.T.* 66f.), but there are differences of detail. The two versions might possibly derive from a common source, but if so the original story has been adapted in two distinctly different ways. Here there is probably a symbolic significance in the seventy-two colours; according to some accounts the number is that of the translators of LXX, as it is also in some Mss. that of the missionaries in Luke x. 1, 17. White being the colour of purity, lines 27–28 presumably mean that all emerged cleansed. The passage may therefore have a baptismal reference. In line 30 'the Son of' should probably be deleted as a dittography (Schenke omits). 124. 2 speaks of 'the seed of the Son of Man' and 129. 18ff. says that 'the son of the Son of Man is he who is created through the Son of Man,' but such a reference is out of place here and moreover *pshere* is

marked by dots for cancelling. For the lacuna in this line Schenke proposes 'to take away defects,' Till 'as a dyer.' Relying on Schenke's restoration Grant (*J.B.L.* 6) suggests a connection with John i. 29, but what can be seen in the photograph is scarcely sufficient to admit of any confident restoration. On either of these two restorations 'the son of the Son of Man' is manifestly an error.

111 (55) The
Sophia whom they call barren
is the mother of the angels. And the
consort of [Christ is] Mary Magdalene.
[The Lord loved Mary]
more than [all] the disciples, and
kissed her on her [mouth]
often. The others too . . . . .
112 . . . . they said to him
'Why do you love her more than all of us?'
The Saviour answered and said to
them 'Why do I not love you
like her?'

For 'the Sophia who is called barren' Schenke refers to 107. 31–108. 1; for Mary Magdalene to 107. 6–11. The restorations in lines 33–36 seem fairly certain. For 37 and 112. 1 Schenke proposes 'The other [disciples saw] him [with Mary]. They said to him. . . .' Dr. Till, however, suggests 'The other [women] also [saw] him [loving Mary],' comparing the Gospel of Mary (10. 1–3 Till; Grant, *Anthol.* 66), where Peter says 'We know that the Saviour loved you more than other women.' This cannot, however, be taken as certain, since the same Gospel (18. 14–15 Till; Grant 68) makes Levi say at a later point 'he loved her more than us' (cf. 34–35 above). In the circumstances probably neither reconstruction can claim to be more than conjectural. The statement that Sophia is the mother of the angels may refer to the planetary powers (Iren. i. 5. 2; Grant, *Anthol.* 173), since these were

fashioned by the Demiurge, who is himself the 'child' of Achamoth; it may also refer, however, to an earlier section (Iren. i. 4. 5; Grant 171f.), where Achamoth conceives a spiritual embryo after the likeness of the guards who accompanied the Saviour. The latter, however, are not angels but their earthly counterparts, the 'spirituals.' Cf. further the notes on 107. 6–11, 31–108. 1 above. In lines 3–4 the words 'he said to them' have been written twice in the Ms., in error.

112 (56) A blind man and one who sees, when they are in the darkness the two do not differ from one another. But when the light comes, then he who sees will see the light, and he who is blind will remain in darkness.

Schenke compares 111. 5–11 above, where another analogy is used. In the darkness of this world both the enlightened Gnostic who sees and the unenlightened man who cannot see are on the same level; in the kingdom of light the Gnostic will see, but the unenlightened remain in his blindness. The metaphor of blindness for the unredeemed is of course common to many forms of religion (cf. Lindars, *N.T. Apologetic*, London 1961, 159ff. on the use of *Is.* vi. 9f. in the New Testament; also Gärtner 192ff.).

(57) The Lord said 'Blessed is he who is before he came into being. For he who is, both was and shall be'.

This saying is closely paralleled in the Gospel of Thomas (log. 19: Blessed is he who was before he came into being; cf. Gärtner 199). Grant (*J.B.L.* 5) suggests a connection with Johannine ideas, noting 'is—was—will be' as said of God in Revelation i. 8 and elsewhere, and comparing also John viii. 58. The passage should probably be understood, however, in Gnostic terms, as a beatitude referring to the 'spiritual,' who

alone truly *is*. He belongs to the realm of light, where he existed before he came into this world, and consequently will return thither. The merely material man, on the other hand, belongs only to this world, and has neither past nor future. Cf. also Iren. Dem. 43 with Froidevaux's note (Sources chrétiennes 62, Paris 1959).

112 12 (58) The
highness of man is not revealed, but is
in secret. Because of this he is
lord of the beasts which are stronger than he,
which are great according to the revealed and the hidden.
And this gives them their continuance. But
if the man separates from them, they slay
one another and bite one another.
And they ate one another, since they did not
find any food. But now they have found food
since man worked the earth.

In Genesis i. 28 man is given dominion over the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, and every living thing that moves on the earth, but this superiority of man is not manifest on the surface in this world (cf. perhaps *Heb.* ii. 5ff.?); on the contrary, the animals are stronger than he. To his superiority, however, they owe their survival. Wild animals who live apart from man prey upon each other, as having no other source of food, and the writer apparently assumes that this was also the case before man's creation. The passage is, however, scarcely consistent with 103. 6–14, which says 'there were many trees for food for the beasts'; but cf. also 108. 15–23.

112 22 (59) If anyone
goes down to the water and comes up without
receiving anything and says 'I am a Christian,'
he has taken the name at interest. But
if he receive the Holy Spirit he has the
gift of the name. He who has received

a gift is not deprived of it, but he who has received at interest upon it, it is demanded (of him).

Schenke compares 110. 26–35, 115. 21f. Segelberg (192) adds 'sayings' 97, the text of which is unfortunately damaged, and 109, and draws the conclusion that 'there was at baptism a definite going down and coming up, that is, it was not a baptism of sprinkling only.' For the idea of receiving the name 'at interest,' i.e. on loan, cf. the Gospel of Truth 40. 9 (Grant, *Anthol.* 159). According to Irenaeus (i. 6. 4; Grant 176) the Valentinians said 'Those of the church receive grace as a loan, and therefore will be deprived of it; but we have it as our own possession.' Cf. also Hermas Sim. ix. 13.

112 29 (60) This is the way it happens . . . . . if any-one is in a mystery . . . . . The mystery of marriage is a great one. For . . . . For the existence of [the world is based on men,] but the existence of [men on] marriage. Understand the association [undefiled?], for it has [a great] power. Its image

113 is in a [defilement of the body]

This passage introduces the first direct reference to one of the leading themes of the document: the 'mystery' of marriage. The text is unfortunately damaged, but some lines can be restored with some confidence. In line 32 Schenke assumes a parenthesis referring back to the first sentence of the 'saying': 'For they (i.e. the mysteries) are seven.' Certainly if a number stood here 'seven' is the only one which would fit; on the other hand in 'saying' 68 the mysteries appear to be only five in number: baptism, chrism, eucharist, 'redemption' and bridal chamber. But there may have been others not here mentioned. The translation of the second part of line 33 assumes a contrast with line 34, involving the Greek word σύστασις; of this only the last six letters are visible in line 33,

and Schenke reads *στάσις* in both cases, taking the preceding letters in line 34 as the possessive, but in the latter line it is clearly *σύστασις* in the plate. This seems to rule out Schenke's restoration of line 35, although the general sense is not greatly different: the continuance of the world depends on men, the continuance of men on marriage. To some Gnostic groups this was a ground for rejection of marriage, since it placed more souls under the sway of the Demiurge and his hostile powers; but here marriage on earth is in some sense a counterpart to the unions of the aeons in the pleroma (on line 36 Schenke compares 107. 2f., on which see note above). The lacuna in line 36 is such that one might restore either 'the association of defilement' or 'the association of undefilement.' The latter appears more probable in that 'its image' is said to be in 'a defilement' (112. 37–113. 1). As noted above, it is doubtful whether this should be taken to imply disparagement or depreciation of marriage (cf. on 106. 33ff.). The Naassenes spoke of the 'lesser mysteries' of carnal generation in contrast to the 'great and heavenly' mysteries (Hippol. v. 8. 44; Grant, *Anthol.* 113).

113 (61) Among the
unclean spirits there are male
and female. The male are they which unite (*κοινωνεῖν*)
with the souls which inhabit (*πολιτεύεσθαι*)
a female form; but the female
are they which are mingled with those in a
male form, through a disobedient (one). And
none shall be able to escape them, since they detain
him, if he does not receive a male power or a
female, which is the bridegroom or
the bride. But one receives from the mirrored (*εἰκονικός*)
bridal chamber. When the ignorant
women see a male sitting
alone, they leap down upon him and
sport with him and defile him. So also
the ignorant men, when they see a

beautiful woman sitting alone they persuade her, they compel her, wishing to defile her. But if they see the man and his wife sitting beside one another, the female cannot come in to the man, nor can the male come in to the woman. So if the image and the angel are united with one another neither can any venture to go in to the man or the woman. He who comes out of the world, they cannot detain him any longer, because he was in the world. It is manifest that he is above desire . . . . [and] fear. He is master over . . . . He is more precious than envy. But if . . . . comes, they seize him and throttle [him]. And how will [this one] be able to escape the . . . . how will he be able to . . . . . often some . . . . We are faithful . . . .

114 . . . . demons For if they had the Holy Spirit the unclean spirits would not cleave unto them.

The author does not immediately pursue the theme of the bridal chamber, but digresses to describe the lot of those who have or have not received 'the bridegroom or the bride' (cf. 7–10). Schenke here compares Hippol. vi. 34. 6, where it is said that earthly man is, as it were, an inn or dwelling-place, now of the soul alone, now of the soul and demons, now of the soul and logoi sown from above from the common Fruit of the Pleroma and from Sophia, the logoi dwelling with the soul in the body when the demons are not dwelling with it.

The sense of the passage is clear enough, although it is perhaps not always entirely consistent with the Valentinian theory as presented by Irenaeus. From 23ff. it appears that the

man and the woman of line 20 represent the Gnostic and his angelic counterpart, with whom he is to be united in the Pleroma (cf. Iren. i. 7. 1; Grant, *Anthol.* 177). There does not seem to be any suggestion, however, in the account given by Irenaeus, that the angelic *pleroma* was thought of as exposed to the attacks of the hostile powers in the same way as the soul in this world, so that the comparison in lines 12ff. is not strictly accurate. On the other hand, the Naassenes spoke of the 'spirituals' becoming bridegrooms, not brides (Hippol. v. 8. 44; Grant 113), and the Gospel of Thomas (e.g. log. 114) refers to women becoming male. The idea of men and women being assailed by evil spirits of the opposite sex is in the context natural enough.

Lines 9–11 present a minor problem of interpretation: Schenke renders 'if he does not receive a male power and a female, which is the bridegroom and the bride.' This Grant (*Vig. Chr.* 136) appears to accept when he writes that the spirits 'will hold him fast if he is not loyal to the Bridegroom and the Bride which he has received from the "mirrored" bride-chamber, presumably at initiation.' In this case we must assume the Valentinian identification (Iren. i. 7. 1; Grant, *Anthol.* 176) of the Saviour as the Bridegroom, Sophia as the Bride, and the Pleroma as the bridal chamber. The points of contact with Valentinianism which the document shows elsewhere, of course, lend weight to this interpretation, but there is perhaps a danger of allowing these known Valentinian associations to colour our exegesis. The present translation follows the suggestion of Dr. Till, that the bride must obtain a bridegroom and the groom a bride. This seems more appropriate in the context. 'Mirrored' in line 11 appears to be the least unsatisfactory rendering of the Greek εἰκονικός, a word used again at 120. 14 with reference to the man 'after the image.' The point would then be not that the Gnostic receives the Saviour and Sophia, but that the mystery of the bridal chamber was the earthly counterpart of the final union in the Pleroma, and thus the means by which the Gnostic obtained

the appropriate power, male or female, to preserve him or her against the attacks of the evil spirits.

Lines 27ff. present the destiny of the Gnostic on his departure from this life. The 'powers' can no longer detain him on the ground that he was in the world and therefore belongs to their dominion (cf. the Gospel of Mary 16. 1–17. 7 Till; Grant, *Anthol.* 67). Lines 32ff. point the contrast: if one of another sort attempts the ascent he is seized and unable to escape. Unfortunately the lacunae in these lines make it difficult to determine the original text. In line 30 Schenke restores 'desire [and wickedness and] fear,' which has the merit of supplying a word which is fairly common in such lists (cf. Apoc. Joh. 65. 10–16 Till; Grant, *Anthol.* 82); but there are several other words which might have been suggested. Dr. Till's suggestion 'the desire [of the body]' is also possible, but perhaps less likely. In line 31 Schenke supplies another word which occurs in such contexts: 'he overcomes contentiousness (*ἐριθεία*)'; for 'more precious than' he translates 'free from.' Till's suggestion 'master over [desire]' would seem merely to repeat the previous line, but this is not necessarily to say that it is impossible. In 32 Schenke reads 'If [they (i.e. vices) become numerous],' which would certainly both fill the gap and make good sense; but at all these points, and in the following lines, we are reduced to conjecture and must recognize the fact. In 34 something like Schenke's 'avenging spirits' is clearly required, although his 'of God' is by no means so certain as the absence of brackets would suggest, while in 35 'hide from them' seems reasonably safe. In the last two lines of the page, however, we are again reduced to conjecture. Schenke compares 'saying' 59 above, and proposes: 'Often people come [and say]: "We are faithful. Hide [us, that we may escape from unclean] spirits and demons."' Here again, however, 'spirits' is by no means certain, and the letters taken for the Coptic word 'hide' might conceivably have represented the Greek *ὅπως*. One might with almost equal confidence suggest some connection with Matthew vii. 22ff. On the other hand, a measure of reserve in

regard to Schenke's restorations does not imply any failure to recognize the patience and skill which he has brought to an extremely difficult task.

Plates 113 and 114 include a small fragment which seems to belong to these pages. It has, however, been photographed upside down. The letters which it contains have been taken into account in the discussion of possible restorations.

114 4 (62) Be not fearful of the flesh, nor
love it. If thou fear before it, it will become
master over thee. If thou love it, it will swallow and
paralyse thee.

The flesh is merely the prison of the soul, and of itself cannot harm the Gnostic; it is therefore to be despised. A later 'saying' (125. 2ff.) speaks of the holy man being holy even to his body, i.e. as Gärtner puts it (164) 'he makes use of the material world without allowing himself to be corrupted by it.' It is only attachment to or concern for the flesh and the things of this world that can give it dominance over the soul. Reference may be made to the disparagement of the body in the Gospel of Thomas (cf. *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas* 36ff.; Gärtner, index s.v. Body-soul relationship).

114 7 (63) Either will he be in this world or in the
resurrection or in the places of the midst.
God forbid that I be found in them.
In this world there is good and
evil. Its good is not
good, and its evil not
evil. But there is evil after
this world, which is truly evil,
namely what they call the Midst. This
is death. While we are in this world
it is fitting for us to acquire for ourselves
the resurrection, in order that when we strip off the flesh

> we may be found in Rest and not walk in the Midst. For many go astray on the way. For it is good to come forth from the world before man yet sinned.

Schenke refers to 'saying' 23, which deals with the nature of the resurrection. For 'the midst' cf. Baynes, *A Coptic Gnostic Treatise*, index s.v.; Sagnard index s. v. *Μεσότης*. Here again there is some disagreement between Philip and the account of the Valentinian system presented by Irenaeus (i. 7. 1; Grant, *Anthol.* 176). According to the latter, the Midst is the temporary abode of Sophia-Achamoth, which she is to leave when she enters the Pleroma to be united with the Saviour. It will then become the final abode of the Demiurge and the psychic, and appears to be a kind of neutral state between the bliss of the 'perfect' and the annihilation to which the merely material is doomed. Philip, however, greets the prospect with a Pauline *μὴ γένοιτο*. For him the Midst is truly evil, the real death. The explanation is presumably that he is writing from the point of view of a Gnostic, for whom any failure to attain to the Pleroma would be intolerable. The 'hylic' and the psychic know no better, they have neither understanding of nor desire for higher things, and therefore would not realize what they miss. Possibly, as in the system of Basilides (Hippol. vii. 27. 1–4; Grant, *Anthol.* 133), it was held that they would be overcome by ignorance, so that they would no longer be tormented by desire for the impossible. On lines 10–13 Schenke refers to 101. 17f.

Lines 16–20 seem to present a development of the Pauline idea of the Christian as 'risen with Christ.' The destiny of the soul, i.e. whether it enters into 'Rest' or remains in the Midst, depends upon its attainment of 'resurrection' in this life, i.e. on that person's joining the Gnostics. In this text 'it is fitting' appears often to be used in the sense of 'it is necessary,' and Schenke sometimes translates thus. In line 21 Schenke renders 'our spirits left the world,' taking *nanous* apparently as the

Greek *νοῦς* combined with a possessive (cf. 116. 4 for another example); but even if such a possessive were possible this does not take account of the preposition *e* before 'come forth' (cf. Till, *Kopt. Gram.* § 342, quoting *Mk.* ix. 44f., for the construction), and moreover to say our *νοῦς* abandoned the world before man sinned does not seem to make sense, even in a Gnostic context. The present translation itself is not altogether plain, but possibly the sense is that it were better to have left the world before man sinned; the problem is to determine what this could have meant for the Gnostics.

114 23 (64) Some neither wish
nor are able; but others
if they wish gain no profit, since
they did not do . . . . . For the wish made them
sinners. As for the unwillingness,
righteousness will be hidden from them both,
and the will . . . . not the deed.

The general sense is fairly clear, but several of the details are obscure; nor are the problems rendered any easier by the lacunae in the Ms. Some have neither the desire nor the ability for some course of action (Schenke understands 'to do good'); others have the desire but it is of no profit to them since they do not carry the task to completion. Thus far all is straightforward. The problems begin in line 26, where *eire* is used absolutely and the next sentence begins in the lacuna. One would expect simply *pwosh gar*, but there is room for more than this, and moreover there are traces of letters after *eire*. A gap has accordingly been marked in the translation. Schenke takes 26–27 as a question 'Did a wish make them sinners?' (i.e. restoring *ene* after *eire*; but *ene ouwosh* seems too long), and the remainder of 27 as the reply: 'But the lack of will' (on which he observes that we should expect 'failure to do'). Dr. Till, however, thinks it impossible to take *ptmwosh de* here as a complete sentence, and suggests that the predicate has been omitted. Finally, in line 29 Schenke's version is less certain

than the absence of brackets would suggest. The two nouns are clearly visible, with the negative *an* after the second (*peire*), but of the verb following the first (*pwosh*) only the one letter *a* at the beginning remains; before *peire* can be seen part of an *n*, with a supralinear stroke. One possibility is that it is the will, not the deed, which does or has done something; but the problem is to find the appropriate verb.

As to the sense, some have neither the wish nor the power (to act aright); others have the wish but do not act upon it. Neither is righteous: even the desire is not enough without the deed. Possibly there is some connection with the theme of James ii. 14ff., that faith without works is dead.

114 29 (65) An
apostolic man who [was] in Asia saw some
.... their house on fire and
.... air in the fires lying
.... the fire. There is water in
.... and they said to them
.... power to save
.... their will. They received
[death as a] punishment, this which is called
115 the [outer] darkness. [The enemy comes]
out of water and fire.

Restoration of these lines is well-nigh impossible, since the left half of the page is almost entirely missing. Dr. Schenke's reconstruction is: 'An apostolic man [who] was in Asia saw some people [who kindled] a couple of fires and worshipped [the two] fires by throwing air in [the fires] and sending water into the fires [burning before them]. And they said to them (sc. the fires) ["God," although] they were [not] able to save [them according to] their will. They received [death as] a punishment, which is called "darkness." Because of this the enemy (sc. death) [comes] out of water [and] fire.' Here it must be remembered that Dr. Schenke himself explicitly says that his restorations differ greatly in their degree of certainty (op. cit. 38). This

is one case where the circumstances justify considerable reserve. In line 31, for example, Dr. Till reads *p*[*ou*]*eei* 'their house'; in 32 Schenke's 'throwing' might be rendered 'lying.' One is tempted to conjecture that the 'apostolic man' saw some people whose house was on fire, and who instead of pouring water on it fanned the flames to a blaze; but this is the purest speculation. In line 37, however, '[death as a] punishment' seems quite probable. In 115. 1 either 'the [outer] darkness' or Schenke's 'darkness. [Because of this]' would fill the gap; for the former, cf. 116. 7, although the phrase there used is perhaps too long for the present gap. At the end of this line only four letters remain. Schenke's restoration '[The enemy comes]' is based on these, but appears to conflict with such passages as 105. 21ff., where 'water and fire' seem to represent Baptism and the chrism. Cf. next note.

115 2 (66) The [soul] and the spirit came into being from water and fire and light, which the son of the bride-chamber ..... The fire is the chrism, the light is the fire. I do not speak of this fire which has no form, but of the other whose form is white, which is of light and beautiful and gives beauty.

Schenke translates 'The soul and the spirit came into being from water, fire and light, namely from that which belongs to the son of the bridechamber,' and adds a note explaining that the 'son of the bridechamber' is the Gnostic. Dr. Till, however, objects that the Coptic cannot mean this, and suggests that a scribe has omitted the end of a relative clause: 'which the son of the bridechamber. . . .' In line 5 Dr. Schenke suggests that perhaps a sentence has been omitted, e.g. 'the water is baptism.' This would certainly supply an explanation for each of the three, whereas the text as it stands explains only two; nor is it invalidated by the fact that 'the light' is said to be the fire, and the fire has just been explained as the chrism,

since the text immediately proceeds to distinguish two kinds of fire. For water and fire cf. 105. 23; for fire and chrism 105. 27f. At 117. 12–14 there is a reference to baptism in light and water, and there it is said that 'the light is the chrism.' On the end of the 'saying' Schenke suggests that it is possibly a reference to the mystery of the bridal chamber; but perhaps with our present lack of comparative material it would be unwise to attempt to define some of these concepts too precisely.

115 9 (67) Truth did not come into the world naked, but it came in the types and the images. It will not receive it in any other fashion. There is a rebirth and an image of rebirth. It is truly fitting to cause them to be born again through the image. What is the resurrection? And the image through the image, it is fitting that it rise up. The bride-chamber and the image through the image, it is fitting that they go in to the truth, which is the apocatastasis. It is fitting for those who do not only receive the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, but have obtained them for themselves. If anyone does not obtain them for himself, the name also will be taken from him. But one receives them in the chrism of the fulness of the power of the [Cross], which the apostles call 'the right' and 'the left.' For this one is no longer a Christian but a Christ.

For 'the truth' cf. 102. 13ff. For 'types and images' (or 'symbols and images') Schenke refers to 'sayings' 69 (where he restores the phrase) and 124, and to pl. 133. 12–16 and 134. 12f. Some of these passages also refer to 'the truth.' The world cannot receive it as it truly is, but only in images and symbols. This introduces a passage of considerable complexity from the point of view both of translation and of interpretation, but Dr. Schenke's notes provide the necessary

clues. For 'rebirth' in line 12 he refers to Iren. i. 21. 2 (Völker, *Quellen* 138. 12–15), which speaks of those who have obtained the perfect *gnosis* being born again into the power that is above all things. This rebirth has its earthly counterpart (the 'image of rebirth') in the Gnostic mysteries, and it is necessary for the Gnostic to be born again through these mysteries [Schenke observes, however, that some Marcosians held an opposing view (Iren. i. 21. 4; Völker 139. 29–140. 10: the mystery of the ineffable and invisible power is not to be performed through visible and corruptible creatures; the knowledge of the ineffable Greatness is itself the perfect redemption)]. The next sentence may be construed either as a question or as an exclamation. Then in line 15 the 'image through the image' is the Gnostic, who through the 'image' of rebirth in the mystery has been born again as the 'image' of his angelic counterpart. He must ascend and with his bridegroom enter into the truth (i.e. the Pleroma, here conceived as the bridal chamber; cf. Iren. i. 7. 1, Grant, *Anthol.* 177). In line 16 Schenke translates 'bridegroom,' although the Greek word here used is νυμφών; correction to νυμφίος seems necessary to the sense. This, then, is the *apocatastasis*, the final consummation and restoration of all things. For 'image' and 'likeness' cf. Gärtner 200ff.

In line 19 Schenke assumes the omission of a negative and understands *mmate* as the verb 'to obtain.' He translates: 'It is <not> fitting for those who do not obtain (them, i.e. the types and images) to obtain the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. But they (the Gnostics) have obtained them (the images and symbols) for themselves.' The present translation takes the text as it stands and treats *mmate* as meaning 'only.' Apart from the need to supply a negative, on Schenke's rendering, it is at least curious that the verb *mate* should be used once only in this passage, and another verb three times. If the present translation is correct, the passage distinguishes those who have received not merely the name but the reality from those who have received the name and nothing more

(cf. 'saying' 59, to which Schenke himself refers at line 22). Segelberg (192) marks the occurrence of the Trinitarian formula, and comments 'It is not quite certain that it was used at baptism, but it is highly probable.' With the present translation the probability is, if anything, enhanced. Cf. also Exc. ex Theod. 76. 4, 30. 3.

In the light of 'saying' 59, lines 21–22 are clear: one who does not obtain 'for himself' has taken the name on loan, and will be deprived of it. Possibly this may provide a clue to the understanding of logion 41 of the Gospel of Thomas: 'He who has not, from him shall be taken even the little that he has' (cf. Gärtner 264). At line 23 Dr. Till reads the last word as *mpsei* 'it (the truth?) did not come by the power of the Cross.' These letters are not altogether clear, but Dr. Schenke's 'chrism of the fulness of the power of the Cross' seems to give good sense. If the interpretation above is correct, however, what is obtained is not the 'types and images,' as he assumes, but the reality of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Gnostics are commonly held to have set but little store upon the Cross and the Passion, but the Gospel of Truth has shown that this view requires some modification. 'Right' and 'left' in line 25 should probably not be linked with the contrast drawn in 101. 15, 108.28 (see notes above), but with some early speculation on the Cross [cf. for example Acta Petri 38, Acta Phil. 140 and esp. Acta And., Laud. 46 (James, *Apoc. N.T.* 335, 450, 359); for other speculations cf. Daniélou, *Théol. du judéo-christianisme* 289ff.]. For 'no longer a Christian, but a Christ' cf. 109. 30f. and see on 116. 8ff. below.

115 27 (68) The Lord did everything in a
mystery, a baptism and a chrism
and a eucharist and a redemption
and a bride-chamber.

Segelberg (191) makes this 'saying' the starting-point for his discussion of the sacramental system of Philip, noting

that the text suggests there were five sacraments or mysteries. At 112. 32 above, however, there appear to be seven (if Dr. Schenke's restoration is correct). Segelberg also suggests a connection with the mysterious 'five trees in Paradise' in logion 19 of the Gospel of Thomas. As he observes, four of the terms used here are borrowed from the Greek, while the Greek equivalent of the fifth would be ἀπολύτρωσις (Schenke had already cited the Marcosian mystery described in Iren. i. 21). Of the five sacraments here mentioned three were observed by the 'orthodox' Church (for Baptism and Chrism cf. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, who remarks (p. 127) that it is probably to the Gnostics that we must go for the source of the separation of Spirit-baptism from water-baptism, and for the introduction of 'subsidiary ceremonies such as post-baptismal unction.' Since the chrism is evidently more important for Philip than Baptism, it is noteworthy that Lampe adds 'even if these rites did not originate with the Gnostic or semi-Gnostic sects, they probably acquired a new and greatly enhanced significance at their hands'). Of the other two rites the bridal chamber figures prominently in Philip (cf. Grant, *Vig. Chr.*), but little is said of the 'redemption.' Segelberg finds but one possible allusion, in 'saying' 98, although the Coptic word which is used for it in the present passage occurs also at 101. 2–3 (as a verb).

115 (69) . . . . . [He said]
I came to . . . .
like the upper . . . .
like the . . . .
all in the place . . . .
this place through . . . .
they who say . . . .
there is one above . . . .
are wrong. He who is revealed . . . .
116 . . . . . that . . . . . which is called
the one who is below, and he to whom the hidden

belongs is that one who is above him. For it is good that they should say 'The inner and the outer, with what is outside the outer.' Because of this the Lord called destruction 'the outer darkness, outside which there is nothing.' He said 'My Father which is in secret.' He said 'Go into thy chamber and shut thy door upon thee, and pray to thy Father which is in secret,' which is he who is within them all. But he who is within them all is the pleroma. After him there is no other inside of him. This is he of whom they say 'He who is above them.'

Dr. Schenke here quotes logion 22 of the Gospel of Thomas, which provides support for his reconstruction of the first part of this 'saying' (cf. also 2 Clem. xii. 2; Act. Phil. 34): 'But [the Lord] said: "I am come to make [the lower] like the upper, and [the outer] like the inner. [I am come to unite] them in that place." [He revealed himself in] this place through types [and images. And (so)] the people who say: "[There is one beneath], there is one above [him]" are in error. [For] he who is revealed [in that way] is called "He who is below."' Grant (*J.B.L.* 5) notes that 'the lower like the upper' is close to a saying found in Thomas and in the Gospel of the Egyptians, but that in both cases the 'programmatic words "I came" are lacking'; since these words are quoted elsewhere as from Egyptians (Clem. Alex., Strom. iii. 63. 1–2) he suggests that Philip drew from the latter rather than from Thomas. This, however, is perhaps to go too far. For one thing our knowledge of the Gospel of the Egyptians is extremely meagre; for another, the 'saying' could be merely an *ad hoc* construction. For further references see Schneemelcher in Hennecke-Schneemelcher i. 111 (g) and 115; Puech ib. 217; Gärtner 127ff. The variety of forms in which

this saying occurs (or something like it) makes caution necessary in the drawing of conclusions.

If Schenke's reconstruction be accepted, the meaning is that the Lord revealed himself in this world 'in types and images' (cf. 115. 9ff. above) in order to effect the ultimate union in 'the other aeon' of the upper and the lower, presumably the Gnostic and his angelic counterpart. The restoration of the remaining lines must, however, be considered conjectural, and this in turn makes interpretation of the first three lines of 116 more difficult.

At 116. 4 (cf. 114. 21 above) Schenke takes *nanous* to be the Greek *νοῦς* with a possessive: 'Our understanding says. . . .' Till translates freely: 'Denn gaṇz richtig sagt man.' As to the meaning of lines 4–6, the 'outermost' would appear from the following lines to be the 'outer darkness' which is destruction; the 'inner' is presumably explained by the succeeding lines with their Gospel allusions (*Matt.* vi. 6, 18, modified at the first occurrence by the change of the pronoun from 'thy' to 'my') and their Gnostic exegesis. In a sense it may be said of the Gnostic, as of Christ, that 'in him dwells the fulness of the Godhead' (*Col.* i. 19, ii. 19; cf. lines 26f. above, where the Gnostic *is* a Christ). Cf. also Gärtner 222f., but his rendering of line 14 ('according to him') rests apparently on a misunderstanding of Schenke's *nach*; according to Till (*Kopt. Gram.* § 339) *mnnsa* has a *temporal* force, i.e. 'after.' If this is correct, the 'outer' may be the visible world or, perhaps more probably, the Pauline 'outer man' (2 *Cor.* iv. 16).

116 17 (70) Before Christ some came forth. Whence they came they are no longer able to go in, and they went where they are no longer able to come out. But Christ came. Those who went in he brought out, and those who went out he brought in.

Had these lines stood in the Gospel of Thomas it is possible

that they might have been claimed as examples of parallelism, and therefore possibly primitive; which may serve as a warning of the limitations of parallelism as a criterion. A Gnostic interpretation is not difficult to find: before Christ, some came out of the Pleroma (and are no longer able to return) into this world (from which they cannot escape). When Christ came, he brought out of the world those who had come into it, and led back to the Pleroma those who had left it. In another context one might think of the Descensus ad Inferos (e.g. in the Acts of Pilate, James *Apoc. N.T.* 117ff.), and substitute this world and Hell for the Pleroma and this world.

116 22 (71) When
Eve was in Adam, there was no death;
but when she was separated from him death came into being.
Again if <she> go in, and he take <her> to himself, death will no longer exist.

Schenke refers to 'saying' 78, where the same idea is expressed in more general terms. Grant (*Vig. Chr.* 134f.) notes that the union represented in marriage reflects an archetypal unity: Genesis i. 26f. says 'male and female created He them,' and Eve is not separated from Adam until ii. 22. Adam therefore was originally androgynous, and it is this original unity which must be recovered. The same conception lies behind the references in the Gospel of Thomas to 'male' and 'female,' or 'making the two one' (Schenke cites logia 22, 106 and 114, and also 2 Clem. xii. 2: cf. further Gärtner 249ff.). Grant also refers to 'saying' 79, which says that those who have united in the bridal chamber (presumably in the consummation) will no longer be separated; but in the case of Eve there was no true union, and hence she was separated from Adam.

In line 25 the pronouns bracketed are masculine, but Dr. Schenke's emendation is necessary to the sense.

116 26 (72) 'My God, my God,
why, Lord, hast thou forsaken me?' He said
these words on the Cross, for he separated the place
.... which was brought forth from
the .... through God.
.... from the dead
.... but
.... being perfect
.... of flesh, but this
.... is the true flesh
.... not a true, but
.... images of the true.

In Iren. i. 8. 2 (Grant, *Anthol.* 179) the Cry of Dereliction (*Matt.* xxvii. 46, *Mk.* xv. 34) is said to indicate that Sophia had been abandoned by the light, and prevented by Limit from going further (for the Cross as Limit cf. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, Cambridge 1939, 155 and note; Iren. i. 3. 5 (Grant 169); Clem. Alex. Paed. 3. 85. 3; I. 283. 8 St.). In line 28 therefore 'he' should perhaps be 'it,' but the lacunae make any reconstruction precarious. The Gospel of Peter (James *Apoc. N.T.* 91) gives another version of the Cry: 'My power, my power. . . .'

Dr. Schenke translates 27f. differently: 'He found mercy on the Cross.' His reconstruction of the remaining lines is: 'For he had separated that place [from the spirit] which had been brought forth by the [Holy] Spirit at God's orders. [God raised him] from the dead. [He did not come (again) as he had] been, but [his body became] perfect, [although it contained] flesh. But this [his flesh] is true flesh. [Our flesh on the other hand] is not true, but [we have (only)] images of the true (flesh).' For 'the spirit' in 29 he refers to Iren. i. 4. 5; 5. 1 (Grant 171f.), this 'spirit' being the offspring of Sophia. On the final words he compares 104. 34–105. 3.

By way of comment it may suffice to add Dr. Till's reconstruction: 'he separated the place . . . which was brought forth from the [Holy Spirit] through God. [The Lord rose] from the

dead, [he became as he] was (before), but [his body became wholly] perfect. [He had] flesh, but this [flesh is] true flesh. [Our flesh on the other hand] is not true, but [a flesh in] imitation of the true.' The general sense is much the same, and in particular the contrast between the true flesh which is Christ's and the image of flesh which is ours appears to be fairly certain; but it is impossible to feel any confidence in regard to reconstruction of the details.

117 1 (73) A bridal chamber is not for the beasts, nor
is it for the slaves, nor for the women
defiled; but it is for the free
men and virgins.

As Grant observes (*Vig. Chr.* 138), 'the way of initiation was, of course, not for everyone.... "animals" are men controlled by material souls (he quotes Exc. 50. 1), just as "slaves" are those who have no part in Gnostic freedom.' The previous references to beasts or animals in this document all seem intended literally (cf. 102. 36, 103. 8–11, 108. 15ff., 111. 2–3, 112. 14ff.), but 119. 22ff. (if the restoration is correct) speaks of Adam begetting beasts, 126. 25ff. envisages the possibility of becoming an animal and thus cut off from the world above, and 129. 7–8 speaks of 'beasts which bear the form of men.' For 'slaves' cf. 100. 2 with its contrast of slave and son, 102. 29ff., 127. 14ff. According to 132. 10f., 'Ignorance is slavery, knowledge is freedom.' Cf. also 120. 17ff., 125. 15ff., 133. 24ff., in all of which slavery, ignorance, sin and wickedness are contrasted with freedom and with knowledge. An allegorical interpretation here would therefore seem fully justified; but Grant suggests no equivalent for the women. Since in the Valentinian theory the 'spirituals' are destined to become the brides of the angels, these 'defiled women' are possibly to be understood as apostates, those who have once

possessed the saving Gnosis but have fallen away (cf. Apoc. Joh. 70. 8ff. Till; Grant, *Anthol.* 83f.; cf. also Barn. v. 4). In line 3 'defiled' is in the Ms. the 3rd sing. masc. of the circumstantial (*ef-*), but the only masc. sing. noun in the context is *παστός* in line 1, and it should probably be emended, with Schenke, to the plural (*eu-*).

117 4 (74) Through
the Holy Spirit we are indeed born,
but we are born again through
Christ. In the two we are anointed through
the Spirit, and when we have been born we are united.

Segelberg (194), following Schenke, renders 'We are born again but through Christ we are born again a second time and anointed with the Spirit. When we were born (= born again) we were united.' Dr. Till objects, however, that *hm psnau* cannot mean 'a second time ; moreover, a different division of the words seems to give a better sense. Schenke takes 'through the spirit' in line 4f. as the final words of 'saying' 73, but if they are the first words of 74 we have a distinction between birth through the Spirit and rebirth through Christ. Two interpretations then seem to be possible: (*a*) the passage refers only to the 'spiritual,' who are born of the Spirit and then reborn through Christ; or (*b*) the 'Holy Spirit' of line 5 is Sophia-Achamoth, and the reference is to natural birth. In the latter case all men are born 'through the Holy Spirit,' but only the Gnostic is reborn 'through Christ.' In line 7 'in the two' would seem to refer to the two periods just mentioned, that of 'natural' existence and that of the rebirth. A possible alternative is suggested by line 12 below, where the same phrase occurs of baptism 'in the two,' namely in light and water; but this would have been easier if line 12 had preceded the present passage. It is notable that there is no reference here to Baptism, but as Segelberg notes, in this text the chrism is regarded as superior to Baptism (cf. 'saying' 95);

yet there are far more baptismal allusions—Segelberg can find only a few references to chrism.

117 8 (75) None shall be able to see himself either in water or in a mirror without light. Nor again wilt thou be able to see in light without water or mirror. Because of this it is fitting to baptize in the two, in light and water. But the light is the chrism.

The point here would seem to be that water-baptism is by itself insufficient, i.e. the rites of the Church (which to a Valentinian are 'psychic' only, not 'spiritual') are inadequate. If a man is to see his own reflection, he requires both a reflecting medium and light by which to see; neither is sufficient without the other (cf. Plato, *Rep*. vi. 507 DE). Water (or the mirror) represents Baptism, and the light must therefore be another ceremony, most probably the chrism. Segelberg (194) quotes somewhat loosely when he writes 'We are baptized "in water and in fire,"' since the text refers to light; but fire, light and chrism are associated at 115. 5f., fire and chrism (as Segelberg notes) at 105. 27f. If he is correct in suggesting (192 and 193, both referring to 'saying' 67) that the Trinitarian formula was employed at the anointing as well as at Baptism, perhaps we may carry the interpretation of 115. 19ff. a stage further: those who merely receive the 'name' of the Trinity are perhaps the ordinary baptized Christians, the 'psychic'; those who have obtained them for themselves, i.e. possess the reality, are the Gnostics—and the reality is obtained in the chrism (see 115. 23). Segelberg's further comment that 'according to the Gospel of Truth baptism in water is psychic and cold whereas chrism is warm' would fit well into this context of ideas, but the passage he has in view is unfortunately one of the obscurer sections of that document (194, referring to *Orient. Suecana* VIII, 1959 (Uppsala 1960), 12; Gospel of Truth 34. 16ff., Grant, *Anthol.* 156; but

cf. Malinine, etc., *Evangelium Veritatis* (Supplementum), Zürich 1961, 15). The reference to Baptism 'in the two' in line 12 may perhaps shed light on line 7 above, where the same phrase occurs.

117 14 (76) There were three houses for places
of offering in Jerusalem. The
one was open to the west and was called
the holy. Another was open to the
south and was called the holy of the
holy (one). The third was open to
the east and was called the holy
of the holy ones, the place where the high priest
entered in alone. Baptism
is the holy house, ... is the holy of
the holy one, but the holy of the holy ones
is the bridal chamber. Baptism has
the resurrection . . . . . redemption to hasten
into the bridal chamber. But the bridal chamber
is superior to . . . . .
thou wilt not find . . . .
those who pray . . . .
Jerusalem . . . . Jeru-
salem . . . . Jerusa-
lem who wait for . . . .
which is called . . . .
holy of the holy ones . . . .
veil . . . .
bridal chamber if not the image . . . . .
118 . . . . . . above . . . . its veil
was rent from the top to the bottom.
For it was fitting for some
from below to go upward.

Schenke refers to 'saying' 125, which also mentions the 'holy of the holy one' and the veil. Descriptions of the Temple usually mention only two chambers, the 'holy place' and the 'holy of holies,' but possibly the porch is here counted as a

separate room (cf. for descriptions *H.D.B.* iv. 695ff., *Enc. Bib.* 4923ff.). Hebrews ix. 2ff. is not decisive, since the author may have in view not the Temple in Jerusalem but the Tabernacle in the wilderness. Segelberg (199 note 18) quotes from Gärtner some references for three chambers: Philo, *Vit. Mos.* ii. 101; Exc. ex Theod. 27. 1 (not 7. 1), 38. 2 (not 38. 1; moreover this refers only to the high priest entering the holy of holies); Clem. Alex. Strom. v. 32. But on Exc. 27. 1 Casey (*The Excerpta ex Theodoto* (Studies and Documents i), London 1934, 121) says 'the expression "second curtain" is derived from Hebrews ix. 3,' so that this also may not be strictly relevant; neither the Philonic passage nor that in Clement seems really apposite. At any rate, the statement that one was open to the west, another to the south and the third to the east is apparently symbolic embroidery. The north 'was encompassed with awe for the Hebrew' (*Enc. Bib.* 1149, cf. *H.D.B.* iii. 559), but this need not be the only reason for its absence here. More to the point is Segelberg's suggestion (199) that the reason why only three sacraments are mentioned in this context (and hence only three rooms, not five) is that these three are acts of initiation, whereas the eucharist and the 'redemption' are repeated cult-actions. The Ms. is damaged from line 21 on, and the name of the second sacrament falls in a lacuna, but Schenke's restoration of 'the chrism' in 23 seems fairly certain. 'Eucharist' would be too long, and 'the redemption' appears less appropriate, although it might be suggested by the occurrence of the word in 26. Whether the gap in the latter line should be restored 'and the' (as Schenke), or by reading 'the chrism' (which would be too long), or by assuming a separate sentence relating to the 'redemption,' it is impossible to say. Schenke's reconstruction of the remaining lines (27ff.) is: 'But the bridal chamber is superior to it (Baptism) [and to the chrism]. Thou canst find nothing [comparable to it. Those who] attain it are those who pray [in spirit and in truth]. [They do not pray in] Jerusalem. [There are people in] Jerusalem who [do indeed pray in] Jerusalem, [but] wait for [the mysteries] which are

called "the holy of the holy ones" [and "that which] rends the veil." [But what is] the bridal chamber if not the image [of the bridal chamber which is] above [harlotry].'

In Heracleon (fr. 13; Grant, *Anthol.* 198) the ascent to Jerusalem in John ii. 13ff. symbolizes the Lord's ascent from the material to the psychic. The 'holy of holies' is the ἱερόν, as distinct from the ναός, and is the place to which the 'spirituals' come. The πρόναος, where the Levites are, is the symbol of the psychic outside the Pleroma who are found to be in salvation. ἱερόν is said to be used instead of ναός that it may not be thought that 'calling' alone without the Spirit is assisted by the Lord. For 'holy of holies' cf. also Grant op. cit. 140 (Isidore), and for the veil of the Temple ib. 103 (in Eznik's summary of Marcionite doctrine); the veil is also mentioned (apart from the canonical references) in some apocryphal gospels (cf. James, *Apoc. N.T.* 91, 169, 195). In the Gospel of the Hebrews it is the lintel of the Temple which falls [ib. 5; Vielhauer in Hennecke-Schneemelcher i. 97 assigns this fragment to the Gospel of the Nazarenes (see on the relation of these documents his discussion of the Jewish-Christian Gospels, ib. 75ff.)].

In line 37, if Schenke's restoration is correct, the 'bridal chamber' is the Valentinian sacrament, the counterpart of the 'bridal chamber' above into which 'some' from below are to ascend (118. 3–4; cf. 133. 5ff.).

118 5 (77) Those who put on the perfect
light, the powers do not see them,
and they are not able to restrain them.
But one will put on the light in
mystery in the union.

In line 6 the text has the optative *marou-*, but the sense seems to require emendation into *mau-*, the negative *praesens consuetudinis*; otherwise it is difficult to explain the link by 'and.' For the sense cf. 124. 22–27, 134. 4–8, and the account of the system of Basilides in Irenaeus (i. 24. 3–6; Grant, *Anthol.* 35): 'he who has learned these things and knows all the angels and

their sources becomes invisible and incomprehensible to the angels and powers.'

118 9 (78) If the woman had not separated from the man, she would not die with the man. His separation became the beginning of death. Because of this Christ came, in order that he might remove the separation which was from the beginning, and again unite the two; and that he might give life to those who died in the separation, and unite them.

Schenke here compares 'saying' 71, which traces the origin of death to the separation of Eve from Adam. Some such conception seems to lie behind some sayings in the Gospel of Thomas (e.g. 11 and esp. 22; cf. Gärtner, index s. v. Unity). See also Poimandres 18 (Grant, *Anthol.* 215).

In line 16 Schenke renders 'those who had filled themselves with the separation.' The present translation, which rests on a different division of the words, seems to give a better sense (*nentahmou hmpporc̆* for *nentahmouh mpporc̆*).

118 17 (79) But the woman is united to her husband in the bridal chamber. But those who have united in the bridal chamber will no longer be separated. Because of this Eve separated from Adam, because she was not united with him in the bridal chamber.

Schenke refers to 'saying' 42, which presents the myth of the seduction of Eve as adultery. As Grant says (*Vig. Chr.* 134f.), 'in the case of Eve there was no real union in the bride-chamber, and therefore she was separated from Adam—still further.' It is difficult to say whether lines 17–18 refer to ordinary human marriage or to the union in the final consummation, of which earthly marriage is the 'image.'

Lines 19–20 refer most naturally to the consummation, and this is probably in the background of all the references to 'marriage' in this document. As Schenke notes, the 'separation' of line 21 is not that of 'sayings' 71 and 78 (i.e. in the creation of Eve from the side of Adam), but is symbolized in the 'adultery' of 'saying' 42. In Grant's words, 'an ontological separation was succeeded by an existential one.'

118 22 (80) The soul of Adam
came into being from a breath. Its
consort is the [spirit. The spirit] which was given to him
is his mother . . . . his soul they gave
to him a . . . . her place. When he
. . . . words which are higher
than the powers. They bewitched him
. . . . spiritual union
. . . . hidden . . . . .
. . . .
. . . .
. . . . bridal chamber, that
. . . .

The opening words indicate, as Schenke notes, a speculation based on Genesis ii. 7. The remainder of the page is, however, damaged. Schenke's restoration is: 'Its consort is the [Spirit. She who] gave it to him is his mother; and with his soul they gave him [a spirit] in her (i.e. his mother's) place. For when he hid himself (cf. *Gen.* iii. 8) [he said] words which were higher than the powers. They bewitched him [since] they [did not possess] the spiritual union which takes place without the hidden [wickedness]. They [hated him. His spiritual union gave] them the occasion [to create the] bridal chamber, that [men might unite together].' In line 24 this rests on the emendation of a letter, but it is possible that the verb was a passive (as in the present translation). 'They' in line 25 he takes to be the archons. For the 'spirit in her place' he compares Iren. i. 5. 5f. (Grant, *Anthol.* 174),

and for 'words higher than the powers' frag. 1 of Valentinus (ap. Clem. Alex. Strom. ii. 36. 2–4; Grant 143).

This reconstruction would certainly fit, and the Valentinian references give it an additional claim to consideration, but the state of the text precludes any real confidence. The Gospel of the Hebrews makes Jesus speak of 'my mother the Holy Spirit' (James, *Apoc. N.T.* 2, 3, 5; Vielhauer op. cit. 107f. also assigns these fragments to this gospel), while for the following lines reference might also be made to the Apocryphon of John (51. 12ff. Till; Grant 78ff.). The 'bewitching' of Adam might be related either to the deceptions of Paradise in the latter document, or to the sleep which Ialdabaoth cast upon Adam (55. 18ff., 58. 17ff.); but this too is conjecture. One possible objection to Dr. Schenke's reconstruction is that it would make the bridal chamber the creation of the powers, and this is scarcely compatible with other references in this document. Even if there is a 'depreciation' of sexual relationships in Philip, which is by no means certain (cf. on 106. 33ff. above), the bridal chamber in this text is normally either the Pleroma or the Valentinian sacrament which is its earthly counterpart.

118 34 (81) Jesus revealed
35 . . . . Jordan the ful-
ness of the kingdom of heaven which
came into being] before the all.
119 Again, he was begotten. [Again, he was begotten as a son]
Again, he was anointed. [Again] he was redeemed.
Again, he saved.

For the last lines of the page Dr. Schenke proposes: 'Jesus revealed [himself at the bank of] Jordan. The fulness[of] the kingdom of heaven is that [which was] before the All.' For the final words he refers to log. 49 of the Gospel of Thomas, which seems scarcely relevant. The missing words may have contained some reference to the Baptism, but it may be noted that the (unfortunately also fragmentary) Egerton Papyrus (PEg. 2) likewise mentions an episode 'on the bank

of the Jordan' (cf. Jeremias in Hennecke-Schneemelcher i. 58ff., and for the fragment ib. 60). The *pe* at the end of line 36 has the stroke which in this position commonly replaces *n*, and would therefore seem to be not the copula but the beginning of a relative clause. Perhaps the sense is 'Jesus revealed (to somebody) at the Jordan the fulness of the kingdom, which was before all things.'

At 119. 1 Schenke reads in the second sentence 'born as an alien,' but the visible letters suggest the restoration 'as a son.' The passage seems to present five stages, of which the second is mostly lost. The first is presumably the divine origin, the second the Incarnation, the third the anointing (*Mk*. xiv. 3ff.? or *Jn*. xix. 39f.? or is it an anointing with the Spirit at his Baptism?); the fourth is clearly his deliverance from the grave, and the fifth his own deliverance of others. Here we have 'the redeemed Redeemer' almost in so many words (cf. 100. 35ff. above).

119 3 (82) If I may utter a
mystery, the Father of the all united
with the virgin who came down, and
a fire shone for him on that day.
He revealed the great bridal chamber.
Because of this his body which came into being
on that day came out of the bridal chamber,
in the manner of him who came into being
from the bridegroom and the bride. So
Jesus established the all
in it through these. And it is
fitting for each one of the disciples
to enter into his Rest.

Schenke takes the opening words as a question: 'Is it permitted to express a mystery?' So also Grant (*Vig. Chr.* 137), who remarks that it is hard to tell whether the passage is historical or eschatological in intention, and adds 'Probably it is expressed as past but really refers to the future; but we

have already seen that in Valentinian thought such distinctions are hard to make.' For lines 8–9 he cites Psalm xviii (xix). 5–6. Schenke identifies the 'Father of the all' with the Saviour, comparing Iren. i. 4. 5 (Grant, *Anthol.* 171f.) and the parallel passage Exc. 43. 2f. (cf. Völker, *Quellen* 104 and note); the 'virgin who came down' is then naturally Achamoth. Against this, however, is the fact that the Father is most naturally taken to be the supreme aeon (cf. the Gospel of Truth 18. 32–35, 20. 19); moreover, it is difficult to account on this view for the following reference to the body of Jesus. It seems much more probable that the author took the title 'Son of God' quite literally (cf. 'saying' 17, which rejects conception by the Holy Spirit); possibly he thought of Mary, the 'virgin whom no power defiled' as descending for the specific purpose of this union. At any rate, this and other passages suggest that he stood rather nearer to 'orthodox' Christian doctrine than the accounts of Valentinianism provided by Irenaeus and others would lead us to believe; but even so the literalism of his exegesis and certain speculative tendencies are already drawing him away into 'heretical' lines of thought.

In line 6 the reading 'a fire' rests upon a correction by Dr. Schenke. In the Gospel of the Ebionites (James, *Apoc. N.T.* 9; Vielhauer in Hennecke-Schneemelcher i. 103 refers to Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der ntl. Apokryphen*, 1909, 134–139) it is said that a great light shone about the place at the Baptism of Jesus. Psalm ii. 7 is quoted in the context, which also refers to the Holy Spirit. A careless reading might have suggested that the words of the Psalm were spoken by the Spirit, and in any case the Gospel of the Hebrews (cf. on 118. 22ff. above) makes Jesus speak of the Spirit as his mother. It is thus possible that Mary was thought of as in some sense an incarnation of the Spirit (cf. Hippol. vi. 35. 3–4, and 7). The fact that Sophia-Achamoth is also called 'the Holy Spirit' adds to the perplexity of the modern reader, but can be quite readily explained in

terms of Valentinian thought. Cf. the Sophia Jesu Christi 98. 9–99. 14 Till, and Doresse 194 on the letter of Eugnostus.

In line 7 it is open to question whether the translation should be 'He revealed' (so Schenke) or 'It revealed' (as Grant). Since Coptic has two genders only, either is possible. If the neuter is chosen, it refers to the fire; if the masculine, it must refer to 'him' in line 6, which in turn, in view of the following lines, must refer to Jesus. The fact that the name occurs in 118. 34 and in 'saying' 82 not until line 12 suggests that the whole section may be more closely connected than Schenke's division into two 'sayings' would imply. If the 'bridal chamber' of lines 7 and 9 is the Pleroma, as would seem probable, the body must have been spiritual, which seems at variance with 'saying' 17 (see note on 103. 23ff.), where as Schenke notes at least a psychic body seems to be presupposed. Schenke further quotes Hippol. vi. 35. 7 (165. 13–15 Wendland); Iren. i. 7. 1–2 (Grant, *Anthol.* 176f.). His translation of lines 10–11, however, does not seem to fit with his interpretation of the preceding lines: 'As he himself originated from the bridegroom and the bride . . .' (the literal rendering is given in a footnote). According to Irenaeus (i. 7. 1; Grant 176), the Saviour is the bridegroom and Sophia-Achamoth the bride; since Jesus is the Saviour, he can hardly have originated from their union. There must therefore have been an earlier union, as suggested above. The simplest explanation of 10f. seems to be that the body of Jesus emerges in the manner of one who has come from the bridegroom and the bride, i.e. in the form of a child. In this case 'the great bridal chamber' in 7 may refer to the Pleroma, 'the bridal chamber' in 9 to the earthly union of which the man Jesus was born. On 13–15 cf. Heb. iv. 11.

119 16 (83) Adam came into being from two
virgins, from the Spirit and from
the virgin earth. Because of this
Christ was born of a virgin,

in order that he might set in order the stumbling
which came to pass in the beginning.

This section is based on Genesis ii. 7, where it is said that man was created from the dust of the earth, and that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. The two Genesis narratives of the creation of man, whether separately or in conjunction, form the basis for various Gnostic speculations. Thus in Justin (ap. Hippol. v. 26. 7; Grant, *Anthol.* 95) the angels of Elohim take of 'the most excellent earth' to make man; in the Valentinian theory [Iren. i. 5. 5 (Grant 174) and Exc. ex Theod. 50. 1] he is made 'not of this dry ground but of invisible substance.' That such speculations were not confined to the Gnostics is shown by Iren. Dem. 32 (cf. adv. Haer. iii. 30 Harvey and iii. 19. 6), which is actually closer to the present passage than the Gnostic parallels mentioned. Another factor is of course the Adam-Christ typology. On line 19 Schenke notes that it contradicts 'saying' 17, which assumes that Jesus also had an earthly father; but cf. the note on 119. 3–15.

119 22 (84) There are two trees in paradise.
The one produces beasts; the other produces
man. Adam ate from the tree
which produced beasts, and becoming a beast
he begat beasts. Because of this
they worship . . . .
Adam. The tree . . . .
fruit . . . .
. . . .
eat of . . . .
fruit . . . .
begets men . . . . wor-
ship the man . . . .
God created [man and]
120 man created God.

For the two trees in Paradise cf. Genesis ii. 17, iii. 22, which mention the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and the

tree of life. The Genesis narrative of course suggests that there were also other trees. The Gospel of Thomas (log. 19) speaks of five (cf. the Gnostic fragment published by W. E. Crum, *J.T.S.* 44 (1943), 176ff., and again by P. E. Kahle, *Bala'izah* i, London 1954, 473ff.; see also Puech 244f.). In Justin (ap. Hippol. v. 26, 6; Grant 95) the angels of Eden and Elohim are 'allegorically' called trees. No exact parallel for the two trees of this 'saying' has yet been noted.

The Ms. has suffered the usual damage at the foot of the page, but the restoration of lines 22–26 appears fairly certain. For 'becoming a beast' cf. 127. 5–11, 129. 7–8. In line 25 Dr. Schenke apparently took the letters visible at the end to be [*r*]*ome nthe/rion*, and translates 'beast-men'; but the second letter seems to be *p*, which suggests the restoration [*afsh*]*ope ntherion*, 'he became a beast.' Schenke's reconstruction of the remainder is: 'Because of this they worship [the beasts which are like] Adam. The tree [whose] fruit [Adam ate is the beast-tree. Because of] this [his children] became numerous. [He did not] eat of [the man-fruit; but it is the beast]-fruit [which] produces men. [And the beasts] worship the man. [But according as] God creates God, man creates men.'

The state of the text of course precludes certainty, but the following lines provide some confirmation for Dr. Till's reading, here translated, in 119. 35–120. 1. The whole passage may then have been a polemic against animal-worship, regarded as in some way the legacy of the sin of Adam. It may not be out of place to recall that in Romans Paul condemns the worship of the creature rather than the Creator in i. 18ff., and introduces the Adam-Christ typology in v. 12ff.

120 1 (85) So is it in the
world. Men make gods and they
worship their creations. It would be fitting for
the gods to worship men.

Whatever may have stood in the lacunae on the previous page, this 'saying' is a brief but telling condemnation of

idolatry. Cf. 102. 31ff., which appears to contain a condemnation of animal sacrifice. Polemic against idolatry has of course a long tradition behind it, both in Christianity and in Judaism. To take but one example, cf. Ep. ad Diog. 2.

In line 3 Schenke translates 'It would have been fitting for the gods to worship men, according to the truth of the works of man'; he makes 'saying' 86 begin at line 6. On this division, however, the meaning of the last sentence of 'saying' 85 is by no means clear. Dr. Till's punctuation, beginning the new 'saying' at line 4, seems to give a better sense. The words rendered 'according to the truth of the works of man' (lit. 'as it is, namely the truth of the works of man') then introduce the next section. The truth about man's works is that they originate from his power.

120 4 (86) As
the truth of the works of man is,
they come into being from his power.
Because of this they are called the
powers. His works are his sons, who
came into being from a Rest. Because of
this his power dwells (πολιτεύεσθαι)
in his works, but the Rest
is manifest in the children. And
thou wilt find this penetrating even to the image.
And this is the man after the image (εἰκονικός),
doing his works by his power
but in his rest producing his
children.

The works of man originate from his power, and therefore are called 'powers.' The remainder of the saying is, however, not entirely clear, since lines 8–9 identify the 'works' and the 'children' whereas the following lines present a distinction; moreover, the identification of 'works' and 'children' seems to contradict 'saying' 121 (129. 21–34). From 15f. it would appear that the author means to distinguish the 'works,' which

are produced by the exercise of muscular force (e.g. in the carving of an idol), from the children who are begotten by a 'power' of another kind, as the fruit of man's rest. In line 13 Schenke suggests that by the 'image' the Saviour may be meant, in which case the 'children' would be the Gnostics and the 'rest' that of the Pleroma; it might then be relevant to recall the use of *δυνάμις* in the Gospels for the 'mighty works' of Jesus. That such ideas are somewhere in the background is probable in view of the parallelism in Valentinian speculation between the higher and the lower realms, but it seems more natural to regard line 13 as moving from above downwards rather than in the opposite direction, especially since line 14 proceeds to speak of 'the man after the image' (the word is the Greek *εἰκονικός*, as in 113. 11 above). According to Irenaeus (i. 5. 5; Grant, *Anthol.* 174), the Valentinians distinguished the 'image' and the 'likeness' of Genesis i. 26. The man after the image is the material, the one after the likeness the psychic.

120 17 (87) In this world the slaves
serve the free men. In the kingdom
of heaven the free will
minister unto the slaves, the children of
the bride-[chamber] will minister to the children
of the marriage. The children of the bride-chamber
a name . . . . The Rest
. . . . one another. They have no need
. . . . .

The new order of the kingdom of heaven involves a reversal of values. Schenke (restoring *νυμφίος* in line 21) suggests that the 'free,' the 'children of the bridegroom,' are the angels of the Saviour, and the 'children of the marriage,' the (former) 'slaves,' the spiritual seed who are to become the brides of the angels. The two groups together would form the 'children of the bridal chamber.' This seems in itself entirely probable, but unfortunately there is a lacuna in line 21 which makes certainty

impossible. Either *νυμφ[ίος]* or *νυμφ[ών]* would adequately fill the gap. 'Sons of the bridegroom' are mentioned at 130. 17, and Grant on this passage notes the Bezan variant to Matthew ix. 15 (*Vig. Chr.* 136; see note ad loc. below).

For the remainder of the 'saying' Dr. Schenke proposes the restoration: '[The] children of the bridal chamber have one [and the same] name. Rest holds sway between them (lit. 'is with one another'). They have no need [to be active] (any longer).'

120 25 (88) The vision
.... they are more . . .
.... in those who are in
.... glories of the
.... are not . . .

In this and the following 'saying' more than half the page is missing, so that any reconstruction is highly speculative. Schenke proposes (if I have understood him aright): 'Contemplation (*θεωρία*) has [a great] benefit ([*ὠφέλ*]*ησις*). They are great [wise men through] contemplation among those who are in [this world. But] the glorious glories [men can] not [receive].' But in line 27 the letter following the gap is not *e* but *s*, and the word therefore cannot have been *θεωρεία*. 'Glories' is visible in line 28, and the phrase *might* have been 'glories of glories,' but in line 29 *mmoou* (which Schenke takes as the accus. pronoun) might come from *moou* 'water,' in anticipation of the sequel.

120 30 (89) .... go down to the water
.... he will redeem him
.... perfect those who
.... in his name. For he said
.... that we should fulfil all
121 righteousness.

Schenke restores: '[Jesus loved mankind; he] went down to death [that he might fulfil it] and purify, [that they] might [be

perfected] who would be [perfected] in his name. For [Christ] said: We wish to fulfil all righteousness.'

Here the final reference to Matthew iii. 15 suggests some allusion to the Baptism of Jesus. Moreover, in line 30 we have almost complete the phrase used elsewhere in this text for 'going down to the water' (*bōk epitn epmoou*, 122. 29, 123. 23); two letters only are missing, and as Dr. Till observes, it is probable that the scribe would have found room somehow for *u* at the end of the line had it stood alone (in *epmou*), instead of carrying a single letter over to the next line. Perhaps we may recall Ign. Eph. xviii. 2. In line 32 it is open to question whether we should restore *bōk* 'go' or *čōk* 'perfect, fulfil.'

121 1 (90) Those who say 'They
will die first and rise again'
are in error. If they do not first receive
the resurrection while they live, when they die they will
receive nothing. So also they speak about
baptism, saying that baptism is
a great thing, because if (people) receive it they
will live.

Cf. 'saying' 21 (104. 15ff.), where the Resurrection of Jesus is in view; here it is the resurrection of men in general. Lines 5–8 seem to involve a certain disparagement of Baptism, in which case the whole passage may be a piece of polemic against the beliefs of the 'orthodox' Church. For Philip, Baptism is merely the lowest stage (cf. 'sayings' 68, 76, 95).

121 8 (91) Philip the apostle said
'Joseph the carpenter planted
a garden because he needed the
wood for his trade. It was he
who made the Cross from the
trees which he planted. And his seed
hung on that which he planted. His seed was
Jesus, but the planting was the Cross.'

This is the one passage in the document where any of the disciples of Jesus (apart from Mary Magdalene) is mentioned by name, and may possibly account for the ascription of this 'Gospel' to Philip. As Doresse remarks (223), 'some apocryphal Christian traditions are also mixed with this text.' He raises the question whether such elements, and the *agrapha*, some 'of a marked evangelical character,' were collected for the Gospel of Philip from existing traditions, or invented for it. For this particular tradition no exact parallel has yet been noted. The nearest so far observed is the legend quoted by Obolensky (*The Bogomils*, Cambridge 1948, 273), that the tree whose wood was used for making the Cross was planted in Paradise by Satanael, who at that time existed alone with God. For early speculations about the Cross cf. Daniélou 289ff.

121 15 (92) But
the tree of life is in the midst of the garden (παράδεισος)
and the olive tree from which the chrism is
made by him for the
resurrection.

Segelberg (193, cf. 191), following Schenke's original version, renders: 'The tree of life is in the midst of Paradise. And 10,000 olives from which the chrism is taken, were formed from it against the Resurrection.' From this he concludes that it was olive oil that was used for the anointing. He also quotes the Ophite formula cited by Origen (c. Cels. vi. 27; Grant, *Anthol.* 89): 'I have been anointed with white chrism from the tree of life.' This conception appears to go back into Jewish-Christian circles, since Gärtner (153) notes from the Clementines the idea that Adam had been anointed with oil from the tree of life (he refers to Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudo-Klementinen*, *T.U.* 70, Berlin 1958, 145ff., where further references will be found); cf. *Vita Adae et Evae*, xxxvi. 2, Apoc. Mos. ix. 3 (Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.* ii. 143f.), Acts of Pilate xix (Latin A: James, *Apoc. NT* 126). In an appendix to his revised version, however (Leipoldt-

Schenke 81f.), Schenke notes a number of parallels from the Nag Hammadi documents published in Labib's photographic edition, and accordingly alters his translation. The *tbe* which he had formerly regarded as the Fayyumic form of the numeral 10,000 he now takes as an unemphatic form of *tbō* 'the tree,' used in the formation of names of trees. This use was previously not attested, but he is able now to list seven examples. Of special interest in the present connection is the parallel he quotes from a leaf published by H. Quecke (*Le Muséon* 72 (1959), 353), which indicates that the references above noted are still relevant. Schenke further refers to Bousset, *Hauptprobleme* 304f. In line 18 he supplies 'came into being' before 'through him' (or 'it'), which certainly seems to improve the sense.

121 19 (93) This world is an eater of corpses. All that is eaten in it is also hated. The truth is an eater of life. Because of this none of those who are nourished from [the truth will] die. Jesus came forth from (that) place and brought the foods from there, and to those who wished he gave [life, that they might not] die.

Schenke, followed by Gärtner (165), translates: 'This world means to eat a corpse. Everything which is eaten of it is also hateful. Truth means to eat life.' The clue seems to lie in the Gnostic disparagement of this world, expressed as Gärtner notes (159) in the image of a corpse (Schenke refers (82) to log. 56 of the Gospel of Thomas). The things of this world bring death and corruption; only those who feed upon the truth find life, and it was precisely the mission of Jesus to bring this necessary food. Cf. also 110. 35f., where God is said to be 'a man-eater.' According to 101. 23ff., the names given in this world are deceptive, so that anyone hearing the name 'God' does not think of the true God but of some

other falsely so-called God. If we may set these passages together, perhaps 110. 35f. refers to the 'God of this world' or 'God as this world knows him.' It may be recalled that the Gospel of Thomas appears almost studiously to avoid using the name 'God' (cf. *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas* 27), and that in that text 'world' and 'corpse' are frequently brought into association.

121 (94) . . . . paradise . . . . paradise. There is . . . . is. There is no . . . . of God . . . . man in it. . . . . this paradise . . . . they will say to me [O man, eat] of this or do not eat [of this according to thy]
122 wish. This is the place where I will eat all things, since there is the tree of knowledge (γνῶσις). That one slew Adam, but here the tree of knowledge made man alive. The law was the tree. It has power to give the knowledge (γνῶσις) of good and evil. It neither made him cease from evil, nor did it set him in the good, but it created death for those who ate of it. For when he said 'Eat this, do not eat that,' it became the beginning of death.

Schenke restores the remaining lines of pl. 121 thus: 'God caused [a gar]den [to come into being]. The man [dwelt in the gar]den. There was [a single unity], there was no [separation among the men] of God in the [garden. The blessed] men in [it are not wont to] be divided. This gar[den is the place where] it will be said to me: ["Eat of] this or do not eat [it, as thou] wilt!"' This assumes a reference to the garden of Eden (*Gen.* ii. 8ff.), which seems fairly certain

both in view of the sequel and because of the fragments of the Greek word παράδεισος visible in lines 28–29; the further assumption of a reference to man's primal unity is, however, more doubtful—for one thing, according to Genesis, Adam was alone until Eve was separated from him, so that the plural is certainly wrong. As the following lines show, the Gnostic ideal is a return to the beginning, a restoration to Paradise. In 122. 2ff. Schenke renders 'although that tree of knowledge is there. It slew Adam, instead of the tree of knowledge making men alive.' The tree which slew Adam is, however, identified in 5ff. with the law, which suggests that a distinction is intended between the tree of the knowledge of good and evil which brings death, and the tree of *gnosis* which gives life. Reference may be made to the description of Ialdabaoth's Paradise in the Apocryphon of John (55. 18ff. Till; Grant, *Anthol.* 79f.), where the so-called 'tree of life' is lethal and the forbidden 'tree of the knowledge of good and evil' is the one which gives life; also to the Gospel of Truth (18. 24ff.; Grant 147f.), which according to one translation speaks of a fruit which did not destroy those who ate of it, but caused them to rejoice. The allusions to the law, of course, recall passages in the letters of Paul (e.g. *Rom.* vii. 7ff.; *Gal.* iii. 21). The law could awaken conscience, but it could not make a man righteous; and it contained a curse upon all who did not fulfil its precepts (*Gal.* iii. 10). Cf. also Ep. ad Diog. xii.

122 12 (95) The chrism is superior to baptism, for from the chrism are we called Christians, not because of the baptism; and Christ is (so) called because of the chrism. For the Father anointed the Son, and the Son anointed the apostles, and the apostles anointed us. He who is anointed possesses the All. He possesses the resurrection, the light, the Cross, the Holy Spirit. The Father gave him this in the bridal chamber, he received.

Segelberg (193) compares Theophilus ad Autol. i. 12, where it is said that we are called Christians because we are anointed with the oil of God. Tertullian (de Bapt. 7) also derives the name of Christ from the chrism (cf. Iren. Dem. 53; Froidevaux 114 n. 8). The verb χρίω and the name Christ occur in association in 2 Corinthians i. 21. Schenke compares a passage in the Apocryphon of John (30. 14–31. 1 Till; Grant, *Anthol.* 73) which introduces a play on the two words χριστός and χρηστός. The title Christ is of course a translation of the Hebrew Messiah, 'anointed'; what is striking here is the association of the title, and of the name 'Christian,' with the sacrament of the chrism. This seems to indicate a certain remoteness from Judaism or Jewish Christianity, although 'Christ' is correctly identified as a translation of 'Messiah' at 104. 7–9 above. On the name 'Christian' cf. Peterson, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*, Freiburg 1959, 64ff. For the 'apostolic succession' in 16f. cf. 1 Clem. 42. 1–2.

19 *the All:* or perhaps 'everything.' The word is the Coptic technical term for 'the universe,' but here it may be more general, referring to the resurrection, etc. mentioned in the following lines.

122 22 (96) The Father
was in the [Son] and the Son in the
Father. This is [the] kingdom of heaven.

Philip here echoes the language of John (cf. *Jn.* xiv. 9ff., and perhaps also xvii. 3). Gärtner (138) notes that the idea that Jesus reveals the nature of the Father in himself is by no means unusual among the Gnostics, and compares 104. 15; but he overlooks the Johannine echo, and fails to observe that Exc. 31. 1, which he quotes, is a citation of Colossians ii. 9.

122 24 (97) Well
did the Lord say 'Some went into the
kingdom of heaven laughing and came out
. . . . a Christian

.... and immediately
.... down to the water and came
.... the All. Because
.... was [a] trifle, but
.... despised this
.... the kingdom of
[heaven] .... if he despise
.... and despise it as a trifle
[he will come out] laughing.

Schenke's restoration is: 'Excellently did the Lord say: "Some went laughing into the kingdom of heaven and came out (sc. laughing out of the world)." [He said] without abuse: "A Christian [has nothing at all at his disposal]. Straightway [this man went] down to the water and came up (again) [as lord] over the All. Because of this [the laughter is not] jesting; but [he had] thought little of this iron [and opened] the kingdom of heaven [which is above it]. If he thus despise [it], and scorn it as a jest, [he will come] out laughing."' This must, however, be considered largely conjectural, since other restorations are conceivable. Grant, for example, comments: 'Most of the explanation of this saying is missing, but enough is left to show that the true Gnostic can laugh because he despises the world and regards it as a joke' (*J.B.L.* 6; a note compares Iren. i. 24. 4). In line 27 the five letters *oua če* are visible after the gap; the first three might be 'one,' the other two the Coptic equivalent of the Greek ὅτι. Dr. Till ventures no conjecture until line 29: '[He went] down into the water. He came [up as lord] over the All. [Not] because [he thought] it was a jest, but because [he despised] this. . . .' One might equally well conjecture 'went in laughing and came out weeping' for line 27, or recall the Rabbinic story of Akiba and his companions who entered Paradise, and of the fate which befell them thereafter (Hag. 14b). Two things only seem reasonably certain: that line 29 has some reference to Baptism (cf. 112. 22f., 120. 30, 125. 9f.), and that he who despises this world and all it contains will

come out of it laughing (i.e. the end of this mortal life is an occasion not for mourning but for joy).

122 36 (98) So is it also
123 with the bread and the cup and the oil,
even if there be something else higher than these.

As with Baptism (so Schenke), so with the bread, the cup and the oil. The first two evidently represent the Eucharist (for the cup cf. 15ff. below), but Segelberg (195) argues, probably correctly, that the oil refers not to the chrism but to the *apolytrosis*: the word is different from those used in connection with the chrism, and from 'saying' 68 we should have expected the latter rite to be mentioned before the Eucharist; moreover 123. 2 suggests only one still higher mystery (i.e. the bridal chamber), not two. To this may be added the evidence of Iren. i. 21. 4, concerning Marcosian worship (Grant, *Anthol.* 193), where it is said that some pour a mixture of oil and water on the heads of the initiates and that 'they want this to be the redemption.' Cf. also Exc. 82.

123 3 (99) The world came into being through a transgression.
For he who created it wanted to create
it indestructible and immortal.
He fell away and did not attain to his hope.
For the indestructibility of the world
did not exist, and the indestructibility
of him who made the world did not
exist; for there is no indestructibility
of things, but of sons, nor will anything
be able to achieve indestructibility if it does
not become a son. But he who has not the power
to receive, how much more will he be unable to give?

For reasons best known to himself, the author here digresses to explain the origin of the world. The simplest explanation of the passage is in terms of the Gnostic myth of Sophia, whose sin set the whole cosmic process in train. Line 4 then

refers to the Demiurge, who wished to create for himself a permanent abode but failed of his purpose since he was neither himself indestructible nor possessed of the power to create an indestructible universe. Lines 10–14 seem to admit of two modes of interpretation: on the one hand there is the idea that a man in a sense lives on in his posterity, which means that there is no immortality in possessions, but only in children. On the other hand the word rendered 'son' may also mean 'child,' and it may be that we should link 11ff. with the passages in the canonical Gospels which speak of receiving the kingdom as a little child (e.g. *Matt.* xviii. 3; cf. also log. 22 of the Gospel of Thomas and see Gärtner 218ff.). The latter would fit admirably if line 11 had 'any-one,' but the Coptic has quite clearly 'anything.' How things can become sons (or children) is not entirely clear, but although some details may be still obscure the general sense is plain.

123 (100) The cup of prayer contains wine and water, since it is appointed as the type of the blood for which thanks is given. And it is full of the Holy Spirit, and it belongs to the wholly perfect man. When we drink this, we shall receive for ourselves the perfect man.

Schenke here refers to John xix. 34, and, with Segelberg (195) after him, even more aptly to 1 John v. 6–8. Cf. also 1 Corinthians x. 16, with its reference to 'the cup of blessing which we bless.' In line 19 Schenke's version is slightly different: 'And it is (the Spirit) of the wholly perfect man.' In contrast to 1 Corinthians xi. 26, the drinking of the cup is here not a showing forth of the Lord's death, but a means of receiving 'the perfect man' (cf. 103. 12); but as 123. 13f. says, 'if a man is not able to receive, how much less will he be able to give?' Segelberg (loc. cit.) finds the expression 'the chalice of prayer' parallel to the Greek *euchelaion*, 'used in Byzantine language to signify anointing of the sick,' and notes

links with the sacramental conceptions of the Eastern Churches; but the *euchelaion* appears more closely akin to the Gnostic *apolytrosis* (ib. 197).

123 21 (101) The living water is a body.
It is fitting that we put on the living man.
Because of this when he is about to go down to
the water he unclothes himself, in order that he may
put this one on.

This passage recalls Paul's language about 'putting on Christ' (*Gal.* iii. 27, cf. *Eph.* iv. 22ff., *Col*, iii. 9f., which speak of stripping off the old man and putting on the new). The baptismal ceremony included the laying aside of the candidate's garments before he entered the water; when he emerged he was arrayed in a new white robe. To this, as Segelberg notes (193), a certain symbolic significance was attached (cf. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* 111f., on the imagery of Baptism in the Odes of Solomon; also Daniélou, *Théol. du judéo-christianisme* 318ff.). For 'living' (i.e. running) water cf. Did. 7. As Schenke comments, the pronoun in line 25 ('this one') refers to the living water, here identified with the living body and so with the 'living man.' He adds a reference to Bousset, *Hauptprobleme* 296 n. 1.

123 25 (102) A horse begets a horse,
a man begets man, a god
begets god. So it is with the bride-
groom and the bride. [Their children]
originate from the bridal chamber.
There was no Jew [who came]
from the Greeks [so long as the law]
existed and [we too had our]
[origin] from the Jews [before we became]
Christians . . . .
and they called them . . . .
the chosen race of the . . . .

124 and the true man and the Son
of man and the seed of the Son of man.
This race they call true
in the world.

The author here returns to the theme that like must go with like (cf. 109. 20–35 above, 126. 25–127. 13 below). The restorations in lines 28–33 are those of Dr. Schenke. For the rest of the page he proposes: '... Christians. Thou [didst see the multitude]. And this [multitude of ours] was called: "The chosen race of [the Holy Spirit], of the true Man, and of the Son of Man," and "the seed of the Son of Man." This true race they (i.e. the Holy Spirit, etc.) name in the world.' For lines 36ff. he refers to 115. 19f., with its reference to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; but the first word after the lacuna in 36 might have been *p*[*noute*] 'of God' or *p*[*iot*] 'of the father' just as easily as *p*[*pna*], although the two former supplements would leave something of a gap still at the end of the line. For 'chosen race' cf. 1 Peter ii. 9. Dr. Till takes the nouns in 124. 1 as nominative, not genitive, i.e. as further titles of the 'chosen race'; they are the true humanity, the Son of Man (cf. *Dan*. vii. 13f. and 27), the seed of him who is in himself the Son of Man. 124. 3–4 Dr. Till takes as passive: ' "This true race" it is called in the world.' The present translation of these lines assumes an original Greek *τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἀληθινὸν ὠνομάσθη ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*. The chief difficulty in these reconstructions is the statement in 123. 30ff. that there was no Jew who came from the Greeks so long as the law existed. It is of course true that some of the requirements of the law (e.g. circumcision) constituted a barrier which prevented some Gentiles from fully accepting the Jewish faith, but as is shown by 99. 29ff., the author had heard of proselytes. One is tempted to recall Galatians ii. 15 and the Pauline 'neither Jew nor Greek' (*Gal*. ii. 28, etc.); but the extant letters do not seem to lend themselves to this.

124 4 (103) These are the place
5 where the sons of the bride-chamber are.

The union is in this world man and woman, the place of the power and the weakness. In the aeon the form of the union is different, but we call them by these names. But there are others which are above every name (104) that is named, and they are superior to the strong. For where there is violence there also are those who are better than the violence. It is not the one, it is the other, but these two are one only. This is the one which will not be able to rise above the heart of flesh.

For 'sons (or: children) of the bride-chamber' cf. 120. 20ff., 134. 5. Schenke takes 'these' in line 4 to refer to the Holy Spirit, etc., and comments that the children of the bride-chamber are in the Spirit, the true Man and the Son of Man, comparing 'saying' 96, which speaks of the Father being in the Son and the Son in the Father. The idea seems at any rate related to the Johannine 'abide in me, and I in you' (*Jn*. xv. 4ff.).

Lines 6–8 present a minor problem of translation. There is clearly a contrast between 'this world' and 'the aeon,' but the construction is not entirely clear. Schenke translates 'The union consists in this world [of] man and woman in the place of the power and the weakness. The form of the union in the aeon is something different.' There is, however, no equivalent for 'in' in the Coptic, and Dr. Till accordingly takes 'the place of the power and the weakness' as in apposition to 'this world.' A correspondence between 'male and female' and 'power and weakness' is natural enough, but it is not so easy to see a comparison between male and female in this world and power and weakness in the aeon; line 9, however, seems to show that these names are a concession to the weakness of men's minds. If Dr. Till is right, this world is defined as 'the place for power and weakness.' The general sense is fairly clear; the problem is to determine the construction and produce an accurate translation.

In lines 9–10 Schenke renders: 'But there are other (names). They are too high for us.' He then begins a new 'saying' at line 11: 'Who are they who are named, so that they are superior to the strong?' This, however, rests on a misreading of *pararan* as *paran* (the text is clear in the photograph), which makes it inevitable that the following *nim* should be understood as 'who' instead of 'every.' For 'above every name' cf. Philippians ii. 9. If there is a new saying here, it must begin with line 12, or perhaps better in line 14, where there does appear to be a change of theme. Lines 12–14, with their reference to 'those who are better than violence,' are probably best interpreted in the light of Luke xi. 21f. and the parallel passages (the parable of the strong subdued by the stronger occurs in this form in Luke only; cf. also log. 35 of the Gospel of Thomas, on which see Gärtner 182f., *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas* 55).

Lines 14–15 are difficult, and no satisfactory translation or exposition has yet been suggested. Possibly there is some connection with the ideas of 101. 14ff. above; or should we render 'As to these, the one is not, and the other is, but these two are one only'? Line 16 is clear enough in itself: the one who cannot rise above the carnal mind is of course the merely material man; but how this is to be linked with the context remains a problem. Schenke takes the final words of line 17 as part of this 'saying,' but Dr. Till objects to his rendering on grammatical grounds. It would certainly simplify 'saying' 105, but it is difficult to find any accurate translation of these words which would fit 'saying' 104. They are accordingly taken here with what follows.

124 17 (105) All who possess
the All, it is not fitting for them all to know
themselves. Some indeed, if they do not know
themselves, will not enjoy what they
possess, but those who have come to know themselves
will enjoy them.

It is not appropriate that all who possess all things should advance to that knowledge of themselves which is *Gnosis* and leads to the knowledge of God. As it is put in log. 67 of the Gospel of Thomas, 'he who knows the All but lacks (knowledge of) himself is deficient in every respect' (cf. *Studies* 27f.). Those who do not possess this knowledge of themselves will not truly enjoy, or profit from, what they have; but those who attain this knowledge will enjoy it (lit. them, i.e. 'the things they possess'). Gärtner (264) paraphrases slightly, but seems to have the meaning; cf. log. 41 and 70 of the Gospel of Thomas there quoted.

124 22 (106) Not only will they
be unable to grasp the perfect man,
but they will not be able to see him. For if they
see him they will grasp him. In no other way will
any-one be able to receive for himself this grace,
unless he put on the perfect light
and himself become perfect light
. . . . he will go
. . . . this is the perfect
. . . .

The translation here is literal, and therefore clumsy; but the passive adopted by Schenke and Till would in English be even more clumsy. The meaning is that it will not only be impossible for the powers to lay hold of and detain the perfect man; they will not even be able to see him (cf. 118. 5–9 above, and note there). No-one can obtain this grace in any other way, but only by putting on the perfect light. Schenke restores in lines 29–31: '[After he has put it on], he will go [before he is seen]. This is the perfect [light].'

124 31 (107) [It is fitting] that we should become
[perfect men] before we come
[out of this world]. He who has received the All
[without being master of] these places will [not] be able

to be [master of] that place, but will
[go to the Midst] as imperfect.
125 Only Jesus knows the end of this one.

The restoration it is fitting' (or 'necessary') seems required at the beginning of this 'saying,' but whether we should read 'perfect men' (Till) or 'spiritual men' (Schenke) must remain doubtful. The former has the advantage in that 'the perfect man' has already been mentioned in the context. So far as the sense is concerned, it does not greatly matter: we must become perfect, 'spiritual,' in this life, or (as in 104. 18f., 114. 16ff.) attain to the resurrection, or else be doomed to the 'Midst' (cf. 114. 15). If a man does not become master of this world, he cannot be master of the next (cf. the Gospel of Thomas, log. 67, quoted at lines 17–22 above). Here the restorations appear fairly certain.

125 2 (108) The holy man is holy altogether, down
to his body. For if he has received the
bread he will make it holy, or the cup,
or anything else that he receives,
purifying them. And how will he not purify
the body also?

Cf. Gärtner 163f., who quotes the Gospel of Truth 25. 10ff. 'Through the unity shall each one find himself. Through knowledge he will purify himself from diversity into unity, swallowing up the matter in him like a flame, darkness by light, death by life.' He who is holy is capable of making everything holy, even to the body. Nothing can detract from the sanctity of the Gnostic, who as Gärtner notes has according to Philip become 'not a Christian but a Christ' (115. 26f.). Cf. also Segelberg 196.

125 7 (109) Even as Jesus perfected
the water of baptism, so did he
pour out death. Because of this we go
down indeed into the water, but we do not go

down unto death, in order that we may not be
poured out into the spirit of the world. When
it blows, it causes the winter to come into being.
When the Holy Spirit breathes,
then the summer comes.

For the perfecting of the water of Baptism Schenke refers to Ign. Eph. 18. 2, with Schlier's discussion (*Religionsgesch. Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen*, Beiheft 8 zur ZNW, Giessen 1929, 43–48). In his introduction (34) he argues from the play on the Coptic words *mou* (water) and *mu* (death) for a Coptic origin for this 'saying'; but cf. Bauer in *T.L.Z.* 1961, 554. In addition to the points raised by Bauer it may be noted that the association of death with Baptism goes back to the New Testament (cf. *Mk.* x. 38 and especially *Rom.* vi. 3ff.). Moreover, as Bauer remarks, even translators occasionally perpetrate puns. The Gnostic, in Paul's words, is 'buried with Christ through Baptism'; he must go down to the water of Baptism, but death has no longer dominion over him. He therefore does not go down to death, otherwise he would be absorbed into the spirit of this world instead of ascending to the world above. The double meaning of the Greek πνεῦμα ('Spirit' and 'wind') leads to the analogy of winter and summer (cf. 100. 25ff. above).

125 (110) He who has
the knowledge (γνῶσις) of the truth is a free man, but
the free man does not sin, for 'he
who sins is the slave of sin.'
The mother is the truth, but knowledge (γνῶσις)
is the father. Those to whom it is not given to sin,
the world calls them free.
Those to whom it is not given to sin,
the knowledge of the truth lifts up the hearts,
which means it makes them free
and makes them high above the whole place. But
love buildeth up. He who has become free
through knowledge plays the servant because of love

to those who have not yet been able to receive the freedom of knowledge. But knowledge makes them capable of becoming free. Love [does not take] anything, for how [will it take anything when everything] belongs to it? It does not [say 'This is mine'] or 'That is mine,' [but it says 'It is] thine.'

This passage, as Schenke notes, begins with an exposition of John viii. 32, 34 (cf. also *Rom.* vi. 16ff.). The relation of 19f. to the context is not entirely clear, but possibly the truth and *gnosis* are to be regarded as the parents of the 'free man' (so Schenke). In 21 Schenke takes *epkosmos* to mean 'against the world,' but this seems to leave the following *moute* without a subject. Line 22 he takes with 'free' in 21, as part of the title given to those in question (so also Till), but possibly it should be taken with what follows: 'Those to whom it is not given to sin, the knowledge of the truth lifts up <their> hearts, which means it makes them free.' Here, as Schenke again notes, there is an allusion to 1 Corinthians viii. 1, but his argument (p. 34) that the passage contains an interpretation possible only on the basis of the Coptic has again been countered by Bauer (*T.L.Z.* 1961, 552ff.), who finds the same exegesis in Clem. Alex., Strom. VII 104. 5–105. 2 (G.C.S. III. 73. 29ff.).

On the basis of the evidence hitherto available it has been generally assumed that Gnostic 'freedom' was tantamount to licence, but this saying puts a different appearance on the subject. The obvious parallel is, of course, Paul's 'hymn of love' in 1 Corinthians xiii, but we may also recall Galatians v. 13f. It is not the least part of the interest of this passage that it takes up so many New Testament elements and weaves them together; but the emphasis is upon *gnosis* (cf. 26f. 'free *through knowledge*'; 29f. '*knowledge* makes them capable of becoming free'). The second half of 1 Corinthians viii. 1b is quoted in line 26, while lines 31–35 seem to elaborate the theme of

1 Corinthians xiii. 4f. (love . . . envieth not, . . . seeketh not its own).

125 (111) The love of . . . .
is wine and fragrance. They all enjoy
126 it, those who shall be anointed with it.
They also enjoy (it) who stand outside
them, while the anointed are standing (there).
If those who are anointed with ointment stop anointing themselves(?)
and go away, those who are not anointed
but only stand outside of them
continue in their evil odour. The Samaritan
gave nothing to the wounded man except
wine and oil. It is nothing other than
the ointment. And he healed the wounds.
For love covereth a multitude of sins.

For the lacuna in line 35 Schenke proposes 'The love of the Father who loves them.' The restoration 'enjoy' in 36 is supported by the occurrence of the same word in 126. 2 (two letters are visible, and part of a third, in 125. 36). The analogy in the following lines presents the relation of the Gnostic to the outside world: the fragance of a perfume is enjoyed not only by those who wear it but by others in their company, but when the wearers depart the others are left in their own ill odour (cf. perhaps Ign., Eph. xvii). So also the Gnostic imparts to the world in which he lives something of his own fragrance, but only so long as he is in the world. When he returns to the Pleroma, merely material men are left to themselves. Cf. the Gospel of Truth 33. 39ff., which says of 'the children of the Father' that they are his fragrance (cf. also note ad loc., *Evangelium Veritatis* (Supplementum), Zürich 1961, 14, citing *inter alia* 2 *Cor.* ii. 15). In lines 4–5 the text reads *etwōu*, which does not appear to make sense. The simplest solution seems to be to read (with Dr. Till) *etōhsu*, as in the present rendering. Schenke's translation differs, but he seems to have much the

same idea as to the meaning: only while the 'outsiders' remain outside do they continue in their evil odour. If they become Gnostics, then of course they too enjoy the fragrance in full.

A scriptural basis for this speculation is found (lines 7–9) in the parable of the Good Samaritan (*Lk.* x. 34): the oil and wine which he poured into the victim's wounds are here identified as the 'ointment.' In line 10 'he' should perhaps be 'it,' referring not to the Samaritan but to the ointment. Line 11 quotes 1 Peter iv. 8 (also cited in 1 Clem. xlix, 2 Clem. xvi).

126 12 (112) He whom the woman loves, those she will bear are like him: if her husband, they are like her husband; if it is an adulterer, they are like the adulterer. Often if a woman sleeps with her husband of necessity, but her heart is with the adulterer with whom she is wont to consort, then what she bears she bears in the likeness of the adulterer. But you who are with the Son of God, love not the world but love the Lord, that those you bring forth may not be like unto the world but may be like the Lord.

There may be an allusion here to the Gnostic myths of the birth of Cain and Abel (cf. on 109. 5–12 above). Grant notes (*Vig. Chr.* 135) that the problem of children who do not resemble their parents had been discussed long before by Empedocles (he refers to Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, Berlin 1879, 423), whose explanation (much like that of Philip) was known in the Graeco-Roman world through popular manuals of philosophy. The 'exhortatory conclusion' (lines 20–25) Grant links with 'saying' 61, inferring that the Gnostic must not love the 'unclean spirits' which wish to unite with him in adulterous unions, and which will hold him fast if he is not loyal to the Bridegroom and the Bride. A New Testa-

ment basis may be found in 1 John ii. 15, which has here been transposed into terms of the imagery of marriage. Cf. also 2 Timothy iv. 10, Polycarp Phil. ix. 2.

126 (113) Man mixes with man,
horse mixes with horse,
ass mixes with ass. The kinds mix
with those of like kind. So also spirit is
wont to mix with spirit and the
logos to consort with the logos
[and the light] to consort
[with the light. If thou] become man
[the man will love thee]. If thou become
[spirit] the spirit will be joined to thee. If
thou become logos, it is the logos which
127 will mix with thee. If thou become
light, it is the light which will consort
with thee. If thou become one of those who belong
above, those who belong above will find their rest
in thee. If thou become horse
or ass or bull or dog or
sheep or any other animal of those outside
and those below, then
neither man nor spirit
nor logos nor light nor those above
nor those within will be able to love thee.
They will not be able to find rest in thee
and thou hast no part in them.

The author returns again to the theme of 'like to like.' Schenke refers to 'saying' 44 (109. 20ff.). In the natural order the various species unite with those of like kind; such monsters as the Minotaur are the fruit of unnatural unions. So also in the realm of the spirit: he who belongs to the higher realm finds his natural associates there, whereas he who is merely material has no place among them. On lines 5–8 Schenke refers to 'saying' 119, especially 129. 7f., which speaks of 'beasts in the form of men.' The passage *might* be held to

indicate a doctrine of metempsychosis, but this does not seem to be explicitly stated in this document; cf., however, Apoc. Joh. 64. 14ff. Till (Grant, *Anthol.* 82ff.).

127 14 (114) He who is a slave against his will will be able to become free. He who has become free by the favour of his master and has sold himself into slavery will no longer be able to be free.

In terms of Gnostic thought, the man who is a slave to the cosmic powers against his will can attain the salvation which is escape from this world and the prison of the body. He who has once possessed the saving *gnosis*, however, and has thereby become free (cf. 125. 15ff.), but has then fallen away has lost his opportunity (cf. Apoc. Joh. 70. 8ff. Till; Grant, *Anthol.* 83f.). This is a statement in Gnostic terms of the 'rigorist' position in regard to the problem of the lapsed (cf. Kirk, *The Vision of God*, London 1932). A Biblical basis is supplied by Exodus xxi. 3, which provides for the case of a slave who declines to take advantage of the opportunity of freedom.

127 18 (115) The husbandry of the world (is made possible) through four forms. They gather them into the barn through water, earth, wind and light. And the husbandry of God is likewise through four, faith and hope and love and knowledge. Our earth is faith, in which we take root. The water is hope, through which [we are nourished]. The wind is love, through which we grow. But the light is knowledge, through which we [ripen].

This comparison of God's husbandry (cf. 1 *Cor.* iii. 9) and agriculture in this world may owe its inspiration either

to Paul or to the parables of Jesus, in which so often 'the field is the world' (*Matt.* xiii. 38; for the Gospel of Thomas cf. Gärtner 184f.). The growth of crops depends ultimately on the four elements: water, earth, wind, and light. Correspondingly, God's husbandry likewise depends on four elements, here identified as faith, hope, love, and *gnosis*. The first three are, of course, the three 'theological virtues' of 1 Corinthians xiii. Some commentators have held in the past that Paul in this chapter is making use of a Gnostic formula, with the omission of *gnosis*, but the editors of the Gospel of Truth observe that that document suggests that the formula 'must on the contrary have been borrowed from Paul by the Gnostics, who have introduced the term *gnosis*' (*Evangelium Veritatis* (Supplementum) 16). The present passage would appear to confirm this view. The restorations are fairly certain, except that the last word in line 30 might have been 'reap'; but 'ripen' seems more appropriate to the context.

127 31 (116) Grace is . . . .
man of earth . . . .
above the heaven . . . .
blessed is he who did not . . . .
128 their souls. This is Jesus the Christ. He deceived
the whole place and did not burden anyone.
That is why the one of this kind is
a blessed one, because he is a perfect man. For this
5 is the Logos.

Dr. Schenke restores: 'Grace is a [countryman]. The countryman's [seed] are men [who ascend to] the height of heaven. And the [blessed] servant is he who did not [injure] their souls. This is Jesus. . . .' If this is correct, it would seem to be based on the parable of the sower (*Mk.* iv. 3ff. and parallels; cf. also log. 9 of the Gospel of Thomas); but grace seems poorly cast in the role of the sower, and it must be said that Dr. Schenke is making the most of rather scanty material. 'Servant' for example is represented in the Ms. by two letters

only, 'blessed' by four, and 'men' by one, while the restoration 'countryman' (or 'peasant') rests on an inference from the occurrence of the word in 32. Altogether this is a passage in which reconstruction can be little more than conjecture.

'The whole place' in 128. 2 is this world, according to the common usage of this text. For the thought, cf. 105. 28ff. In line 3 the translation takes *paei nteimine* together, but perhaps they should be separated: 'that is why this one is blessed in this way' (so Schenke), or 'so blessed.' At some points in this text, as here, διὰ τοῦτο or its Coptic equivalent seems to refer not to what precedes but to what follows (cf. for example some occurrences of the phrase in 1 *Jn.*). Here it would seem to be the fact that 'he is a perfect man' which explains why he is so blessed. 'Burden' in line 2 appears to prepare the way for the following 'sayings,' (cf. 'grieve' in 9ff.).

128 5 (117) Ask us about him, since it is difficult
to set him upright. How shall we be able
to accomplish (κατορθοῦν) this great thing?

Schenke renders 'Ask us not about him,' apparently taking *mmon* for a negative, but to this Dr. Till objects that syntactically *mmon* cannot be the negative, although one certainly is to be expected. In point of fact 'us' is rendered twice in the text, by the suffix *-n* and by *mmon*, so that we may have a scribal error. In line 6 'set him upright' is a literal rendering of the Coptic; Schenke has 'wiederaufzurichten,' while Till hesitates between 'auf-' and 'darzustellen.' The sense appears to be 'Ask us not about him, since it is difficult to describe (depict, represent) him.' If this be correct, we may perhaps recall the saying of Plato, that it is difficult to know God, and impossible to describe him to all and sundry (described by Chadwick (*Origen: Contra Celsum* 429 n. 1, on c. Cels. vii. 42) as 'perhaps the most hackneyed quotation from Plato in Hellenistic writers.' He refers for 'a formidable (though not complete) list of references' to Geffcken, *Zwei*

griech. Apologeten 174f.). To the Gnostics, of course, the supreme God was entirely beyond man's comprehension (cf. for example Apoc. Joh. 22. 17–26. 6 Till; Grant, *Anthol.* 70f.). Here this incomprehensibility is apparently transferred to the Logos. Schenke begins a new 'saying' with line 7, but once again it is possible to question whether this is correct. At any rate it seems more natural to take the two succeeding questions together, rather than to separate them; and there does appear to be a certain continuity of thought.

128 7 (118) How will he give rest to every-one? First and foremost it is not fitting to grieve (λυπεῖν) anyone, whether great or small, believer or unbeliever; then to give rest to those who rest upon the good. There are some whose advantage it is to give rest to him who is well. He who does good cannot give them rest, for he does not come of his own will. But he cannot grieve, since he does not cause them to be oppressed. But he who is well grieves them often. He is not so, but their wickedness grieves them. He who has the nature gives joy to the good. But some through this grieve badly.

The 'answer' here does not appear to match the question. What is asked is how 'he' (presumably the Logos) can give rest to everyone, whereas the 'reply' seems to lay the primary emphasis upon matters of conduct; but an ethical interpretation of lines 8–11 leaves the remainder well-nigh incomprehensible. Possibly some disorder has crept into the text, but with the text as it stands two lines of interpretation appear to be open. The first is to assume that the passage refers to the activity of the Gnostic, that in this tortuous fashion the author is trying to give

expression to the recurrent theme of 1 John, that life and conduct are the true tests of religion and of a man's relationship with God. It cannot be said, however, that this altogether solves all the problems. The alternative is to take lines 8–11 as referring to the 'him' of line 7: it is not appropriate for him to vex or distress anyone; his function is to give 'rest' to those whose delight is in the good. Now some find it advantageous to minister to the prosperous (12f.; cf. *Lk.* vi. 32ff.?). He who (truly) does good (i.e. 'he' in line 7 as distinct from 'him who is well,' perhaps in the worldly sense, in 13) cannot give them the true rest; he has not come of his own will (cf. *Jn.* vi. 38f., etc.?), and must therefore fulfil the purpose for which he was sent. On the other hand he cannot cause distress, since that is not in his nature; he has not come as an oppressor (cf. *Lk.* xxii. 25?). In contrast the prosperous, 'he who fares well' in the worldly sense, does cause distress to those who hope for his favours (cf. Juvenal, Sat. v; Martial, Epp. i. 43, iii. 60 on the treatment of clients by their patrons in ancient Rome). He who truly does good is not like this; if any are distressed by his presence it is because of their own wickedness. One who has this nature (the truly good nature) gives joy to the good, but this very fact is in itself an occasion of distress to some (cf. *Matt.* xx. 1–16, esp. 15?).

If this be correct, we must distinguish two leading figures, the one who 'is well' and prospers as this world counts prosperity, and the one who 'does good' in the true sense of the words. At any rate such an interpretation would make some sense of the passage, and provide continuity with what has gone before: Jesus 'did not burden anyone' (line 2); he is a perfect man and blessed, but it is not easy to declare the ways of God to men whose minds are set upon the things of the world.

128 23 (119) A householder acquired
everything, whether son or slave or
cattle, or dog or pig or corn
or barley or chaff or grass or

[bones] or flesh or acorn. But he was a wise man, and knew the food of each. Before the children he set bread [and oil and meat.] To the slaves he gave castor [oil and] meal, and to the cattle [he gave barley] and chaff and grass. [To the] dogs he cast bones, [to the pigs] he threw acorns
129 and . . . . of bread. So the disciple of God. If he is wise he understands (αἰσθάνεσθαι) the discipleship. The bodily forms will not deceive him, but he will look to the state (διάθεσις) of the soul of each one and speak with him. There are many beasts in the world which bear the form of men. If he recognize them, to the swine he will cast acorns, but to the cattle he will throw barley and chaff and grass; to the dogs he will throw bones; to the slaves he will give the first, to the sons he will give the perfect.

In contrast, this 'saying' is quite straightforward. A wise householder knows the appropriate food for his animals and for the members of his household, and gives to each accordingly. In the same way the wise disciple knows the spiritual needs of men, and the nourishment appropriate to each. He is not deceived by the outward semblance, but discerns the true state of each one. The restorations in pl. 128 find support in the remainder of the 'saying,' and consequently may be regarded as comparatively certain.

At line 30 the modern reader may wonder what were the reactions of the slaves to a diet of castor oil. The word is *κίκι*, for which Liddell and Scott give the meanings 'castor oil; also the tree or its fruit.' They refer to Herod. ii. 94, where it is said that the oil was used by the Egyptians for anointing, and that they called it *κίκι*; also to Plato, Tim. 60a. The word

also occurs in an account in PHibeh i. 121. 17, among other ingredients. In 129. 1 the word *mamou* remains a mystery, but must evidently mean something like 'crusts' or 'waste' (Schenke has 'Brot-Abfall(?)'). For 'beasts in the form of men' cf. 119. 22ff., 127. 5ff.; also Iren. Dem. 61. Schenke (82) compares Epiph. xxiv. 5. 2 (Holl I. 262. 8–10).

In lines 12–14 Schenke translates 'To the slaves he will give first. To the children he will give last.' To feed the slaves before the family seems, however, a strange procedure, and there would appear to be much in favour of Dr. Till's interpretation: the slaves are given the first elements of doctrine, the children the complete and perfect (τέλειος) instruction. The 'beasts' represent material men, the slaves the psychic (or novices in the path of *gnosis*), the children the Gnostics; each has the appropriate nourishment, for the beasts material, for the 'men' spiritual.

129 14 (120) There is the Son of man and there is the son of the Son of man. The Lord is the Son of man and the son of the Son of man is he who is created through the Son of man. The Son of Man received from God the power to create. He has (also) the ability to beget.

The Son of Man is mentioned at 111. 29f., where 'son of the Son of Man' is probably an error, and at 124. 1f., where this title is immediately followed by a reference to 'the seed of the Son of Man.' Both these passages are unfortunately damaged. The Son of Man appears in Irenaeus' account of the Ophite theory (i. 30; Grant, *Anthol.* 52, 54), where he is distinguished from Christ and has no soteriological function; but in Heracleon (fr. 35; Grant 203) the Saviour is himself also Son of Man (for Valentinianism cf. Sagnard 631 s. v. Ἄνθρωπος 6). The title occurs nine times in the Berlin Coptic codex (see Till's index,

317), six of them in the Sophia Jesu Christi: at 98. 6ff. Bartholomew asks for an explanation of the name, at 101. 6ff. the Son of Man is identified with Christ, at 102. 15–103. 5 (spoken by the Redeemer!) his masculine aspect is said to be the Redeemer (cf. 108. 1–6). The one occurrence in the Apocryphon of John (47. 15f. Till; Grant 77; also in the variant copy published by Labib. pl. 62. 14–15) appears in the Berlin text without any preparation, and seems related to the Ophite theory (cf. Grant 54; for other documents cf. Doresse 166, 178, 204). Possibly the full publication of the Nag Hammadi texts, including the 'longer recensions' of the Apocryphon, may shed further light on the Gnostic use of the figure, and on the development from one document to another.

The present passage provides its own explanation: the Son of Man is the Lord, i.e. Christ, as in the canonical Gospels; the son of the Son of Man is the Gnostic, who has been born again through Christ (cf. 117. 6f.). This rendering follows Schenke in taking *petsōnt* in line 18 as a passive ('he who is created'); Dr. Till takes it as active, and renders 'he who creates through the Son of Man.' Crum (Dict. 345a) lists for *sōnt* an intransitive use 'be created,' but his reference to Romans i. 25 appears to be an error (it has not been possible to verify his O.T. references). From the examples listed in Wilmet's concordance it is clear that the transitive use predominates (twelve out of thirteen cases), but the use of *ntausōnt* to render ἐκτίσθησαν in Revelation iv. 11 seems to show that a passive sense is possible. The reference to 'begetting' and 'creating' leads to an extended discussion of the theme in the next 'saying' (cf. 106. 22ff., 108. 34ff., 120. 4ff.).

129 21 (121) He who has received the ability to create is a creature. He who has received begetting is an off-spring. He who creates cannot beget. He who begets has power to create. But they say 'He who creates, begets.' But his off-spring is a creature. Because of this

the offspring are not his children but . . . .
. . . He who creates, works [openly]
and is himself [visible]
He who begets [works in secret]
and . . . .
image. He who creates [creates]
openly. But he who begets [begets]
sons in secret.

This passage presents a problem for the translator, in the occurrence of *petsont* in lines 23 and 25. In the latter it seems to mean quite clearly 'he who creates,' but this rendering in line 23 produces a statement which is manifestly wrong. The sense appears to be that what is created (a chair, a table, or a statue, for example) is a creature, and has no power of procreation. One who is begotten, however, has power to create. The objection in line 25 would then rest upon the metaphorical use of 'child' to describe the work of a man's hands or of his brain. This is answered in line 26 by the affirmation that such 'off-spring' are not children. The following lines then develop a contrast (cf. 120. 10ff.) between the craftsman who works in the open, where he can be seen, and the father who begets his children in the privacy of the bridal chamber. This leads to a further discussion of the 'mystery' of marriage.

The difficulty of this interpretation is that it would require *petsōnt* in line 23 (and *trefsōnt* in line 22) to be taken as passive, while in lines 25, 28 and 32 (restored) it must be active. Possibly the translator has misunderstood the Greek original (there are at least two possible cases in the Gospel of Thomas: log. 7 (81. 28 Labib, cf. Kasser, *L'Evangile selon Thomas*, Neuchâtel 1961, 38) and 62 (91. 26); cf. Guillaumont et al., *The Gospel according to Thomas* ad locc.). Both Schenke and Till keep the active throughout this 'saying.' In line 27 Schenke supplies 'images' (cf. 32). In lines 31–32 he restores: . . . [is himself hidden. The off-spring is not like] the image.'

If *petsōnt* is to be taken as active throughout, the passage does not carry its meaning on the surface, and we must seek a 'Gnostic' interpretation. Perhaps we have here a contrast between the Saviour, who has the power both to create and to beget (cf. lines 19–21), and the Demiurge, who has only the power to create. The latter's works are manifest (cf. *Rom.* i. 20, interpreted in terms of Gnosticism), whereas the work of the Saviour is carried on in secret. If this be correct, it may be that we have here not a misunderstanding by the Coptic translator, but a deliberate modification in the interest of Gnostic theory.

(122) [Nobody will be able to] know what is [the day when the man] and the woman unite with one another, except them alone. For marriage in the world is a mystery for those who have taken a wife. But if the marriage of uncleanness be hid, how much more is the marriage undefiled a true mystery. It is not fleshly but pure, and does not belong to desire but to the will. It does not belong to the darkness or the night, but belongs to the day and the light. If a marriage is (openly) exposed, it becomes harlotry, and the bride plays the harlot not only when she receives the seed of another man but even if she leaves her bed and is seen. Only she may reveal herself to her father and her mother, and the friend of the bridegroom and the sons of the bridegroom. To these it is given to enter every day into the bridal chamber. But the others, let them desire even to hear her voice and enjoy the ointment, and let them be nourished from the crumbs that fall from the table like the dogs. Bridegrooms and

brides belong to the bridal chamber. None shall be able to see the bridegroom with the bride except he become this.

Grant (*Vig. Chr.* 136) remarks 'The Matthaean parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins ends with a cryptic eschatological saying: "No one knows the day" (xxv. 13). But Gnostics know what this saying means,' and then quotes this passage, with a reference to Hebrews xiii. 4 for 'marriage undefiled' in line 5 of pl. 130. His quotation from Matthew is not exact (xxiv. 36 would be more apt) and in Hebrews it is the *κοίτη* that is undefiled (but *γάμος* occurs in the same verse), but his further reference to Ephesians v. 32 is much to the point, and may indicate the germ from which this whole speculation grew. As noted at 107. 31ff. above, there was in Gnostic circles a tendency to assimilate the Church and Sophia, and from this (quite apart from any influence which may have been exerted by mythological conceptions of a 'sacred marriage') a considerable variety of speculation appears to have developed. For darkness and the night in contrast with the day and the light, cf. 1 Thessalonians v. 5ff. On 'the marriage undefiled' Schenke comments, probably correctly, that perhaps the marriage of Soter and Achamoth is meant, referring to Iren. i. 7. 1 (Grant, *Anthol.* 176) and its parallel in Exc. 64; but this marriage in the higher sphere has its counterpart not only in ordinary human marriage (the 'marriage of uncleanness'), but also in the Gnostic sacrament. As Grant says (*Vig. Chr.* 137), 'it is impossible for us to tell whether these Gnostics were discussing human or spiritual marriage, or whether in their minds there was a significant difference between the two.' The problem is complicated by the fact that the 'spiritual' marriage appears on two levels.

Lines 10ff. appear intended to explain why the 'marriage undefiled' is a 'mystery,' although it belongs to the day and not to the night. Even in the case of an ordinary human marriage its intimacies are not exposed to the general view

(cf. line 4); how much more the 'spiritual' marriage, which is so much more sacred! This section, however, appears to reflect a certain remoteness from Palestinian custom: according to Mackie and Ewing (Hastings D.C.G. ii. 137) 'the bridegroom's friend (*Jn.* iii. 29) must be distinguished from "the children of the bride-chamber" (*Matt.* ix. 15), who were simply the invited guests.' Philip, however, appears to take the latter as the children of the marriage. Moreover, even if it was a part of the 'friend's' function to testify to the consummation of the marriage and the virginity of the bride, this scarcely justifies the statement of 17f. (cf. further *T.W.B.* i. 646ff., iv. 1094; Strack-Billerbeck i. 46, 500f.). Grant (*Vig. Chr.* 136 n. 24) draws attention to the variant at Matthew ix. 15 in Codex Bezae and the Latin, comparing also Exc. 79, and refers for the text to Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, Tübingen 1910, 180–181. Cf. also 120. 17ff. above.

In lines 19 and 21 the text has the optative *marou* (cf. 118. 6), but emendation to *mau* is not in this case necessary: 'the others may yearn' or 'as to the others, let them yearn' makes perfectly good sense. Schenke here cites Matthew xxv. 1–12 and John iii. 29 (where, however, the friend of the bridegroom rejoices to hear *his* voice, not the bride's). For the 'ointment' cf. 125. 35ff. Lines 21f., as Schenke notes, recall Mark vii. 24–30. In line 26 Dr. Schenke supplies 'unless he is in this (bride-chamber),' while Dr. Till suggests 'except he become this (i.e. bridegroom or bride).' Either would fit the Valentinian theory: to see the Bridegroom and the Bride one must become a bridegroom or a bride, and participate in the sacrament of the bridal chamber.

130 26 (123) When Abraham
..... that he was to see what he was to see,
he circumcised the flesh of uncircumcision,
teaching us that it is fitting to destroy the flesh
.... this world so long as their
.... and are alive

[If they are revealed] they die according to [the pattern] of the man who was revealed [As long as] the bowels of the man are hidden, the man
131 is alive. When his bowels are exposed and come out of him, the man will die. So also with the tree: while its root is hidden it sprouts . . . . If its root is exposed, the tree dries up. So is it with every birth that is in the world, not only with the revealed but with the hidden. For so long as the root of wickedness is hidden, it is strong. But when it is recognized it is dissolved. But if it is revealed it perishes. That is why the logos says: Already the axe is laid at the root of the tree. It will not cut—what is cut sprouts again—but the axe delves down to the bottom until it brings up the root. But Jesus plucked out the root of the whole place, but the others partially. As for us, let each one of us dig down after the root of evil which is within him, and let him pluck it out of his heart to the root. But it will be plucked out if we recognize it. But if we are ignorant of it, it strikes root in us and brings forth its fruit in our hearts. It is master over us and we are its slaves. It takes us captive, so that we do what we do not want and what we want we do [not] do. It is powerful because we have not recognized it. While it exists it is active . . . . is the mother of . . . . Ignorance [is the servant of (?) . . . . . . those that come from [ignorance (?) . .] neither were nor [are] nor shall be. [But those who are in the truth (?)],

132 they will be perfect when all the truth is revealed. For the truth is like ignorance: while it is hidden it abides in itself, but when it is revealed and recognized it is praised inasmuch as it is stronger than ignorance and error. It gives freedom. The Logos said: If you know the truth the truth will make you free. Ignorance is a slave, knowledge is freedom. When we recognize the truth we shall find the fruits of the truth in our hearts. If we unite with it, it will bring our fulfilment.

A 'saying' of this length must obviously raise the question whether Schenke is correct in describing this document as 'a kind of *florilegium*' (op. cit. 33; cf. Introduction). Indeed, this 'saying' itself could be sub-divided, although there is a certain connection of thought running through it. In 130. 27 Schenke supplies 'rejoiced,' with a reference to John viii. 56; but (since Philip does not appear to share completely the Gnostic aversion to the Old Testament) it may be that we should go back also to Genesis xvii, where verse 17 records that Abraham 'laughed.' Whatever stood at the beginning of line 30 (Schenke supplies 'the members of,' perhaps with *Col.* iii. 5 in mind), it is clear that circumcision is here treated as a symbol of renunciation of the world and of material things (in the Gospel of Thomas, log. 53, circumcision is rejected altogether; cf. *Studies* 104). In the next sentence Schenke restores: 'So long as [their passions are hidden they] endure and are alive,' which would certainly make good sense. Evil desires endure so long as they are kept secret, but when they are exposed they perish. This theme is then illustrated by the two examples of 'the man who was revealed' (perhaps, as Dr. Till suggests, 'the visible man,' i.e. man in this life) and the tree. 131. 4 contains the hitherto unattested verb

lehēt, which must mean something like 'grow' (Schenke) or 'live' (Till). The 'revealed and hidden' of lines 7–8 may perhaps recall Colossians i. 16, while 'the root of wickedness' suggests 1 Timothy vi. 10; but these can scarcely be claimed as quotations. Lines 12–13, however, clearly quote Matthew iii. 10 par., as Schenke observes. It is worthy of note that this saying, which in the canonical Gospels is uttered by John the Baptist, is here ascribed to the *logos*; but whether this *logos* is the Logos or the word of Scripture is not entirely clear.

The following lines elaborate this theme, although it may perhaps be questioned whether Philip had ever tried to dig out the roots of a tree with an axe! 'Of the whole place' (i.e. of this world—so Till) is the literal meaning; Schenke translates 'utterly and completely.' The main point here is that Jesus accomplished in full what others had only partly achieved. The Gnostic likewise must destroy the evil that is in him, which he does by recognizing it for what it is (cf. perhaps log. 40 of the Gospel of Thomas, and for evil 'in the heart' log. 45). 'Are ignorant of it' in 23 is again literal ('do not recognize it'—Till). On 27f. Schenke compares Romans vii. 19.

In lines 30ff. Schenke restores: '[But Ignorance] is the mother of [evil for us]. Ignorance [is the servant of Death, and] what comes from [Ignorance] neither was, nor is, nor shall be (cf. 133. 21–24). [But the other] (i.e. what comes of the Truth) shall be perfected when the whole truth is revealed.' This is certainly possible, and finds support in the following comparison of 'truth' and 'ignorance'; but Till notes that the verb 'serve,' restored in 32, is used at 107. 18 with a different preposition.

It was said at 101. 14ff. above that light and darkness, life and death, the right and the left, are brothers one to another. So too presumably are truth and error, at least to the extent indicated in 132. 2ff.; but truth is stronger than error. In the words of John viii. 32, 'the truth shall make you free.' Cf. 125. 15ff., 127. 14ff., 133. 24ff.

(124) Now we have the manifest things of the creation. We say they are the strong which are honoured. But the hidden are the weak which are despised. So is it with the revealed in the truth: they are weak and despised, but the hidden are the strong and are honoured. But the mysteries of the truth are revealed as types and images.

On these lines Schenke refers to 'sayings' 12, 67 and 69; also to 133. 12–16, 134. 12f. Perhaps we may also recall such passages as Romans i. 20 (on 14f.) and 1 Corinthians xii. 22ff. (on 15ff.; in this case Paul's language is being transposed into another key). Even more apposite is 1 Corinthians i. 26ff. The meaning seems to be that now (in this world) it is the visible things which are regarded as strong and held in honour, while things invisible are despised; but in reality it is the hidden things which are strong and honoured. On 'types and images' Schenke refers to 133. 12–16 below, where the 'symbols and weaknesses' are said to be despised (or worthless) in comparison with the perfect glory.

Schenke begins a new 'saying' in line 21, but Dr. Till thinks the explanation of the difference between the manifest and the hidden is still going on; moreover, this sentence seems to him to have a better meaning in connection with what precedes, and he has doubts about a new 'saying' beginning with a sentence containing δέ. This is, however, another point at which the question seems to arise: is this document in fact a collection of 'sayings,' originally more or less independent? Lines 21–23 seem, indeed, to form a transition between the two sections, and (as already observed) the theme of the preceding lines is taken up again at 133. 12ff. There would therefore appear to be grounds for the view that the document is more closely knit and less chaotic in its arrangement than is at first sight evident.

For the sake of uniformity, Schenke's numbering has been

retained. Till begins 'saying' 125 with the sentence about the veil in line 23.

132 21 (125) But the bridal chamber is hidden. It is the holy of the holy one. The veil at first concealed how God controlled the creation, but when the veil is rent and the things within are exposed this house will be left deserted, or rather will be [destroyed]. But the whole deity will not flee [from] these places again into the holy of the holy [ones], for it will not be able to mix with the [unmixed light and] the [flawless] pleroma, but will be under the wings of the Cross [and under its] arms. This ark will be [for them] deliverance when the flood

133 of water becomes powerful over them. If some are in the tribe of the priesthood, these will be able to go within the veil with the high priest. Because of this the veil was not rent at the top only, since it would be open only for those above; nor was it rent at the bottom only, since it would be revealed only to those below; but it was rent from top to bottom. Those above opened to us who are below, in order that we might go in to the secret of the truth. This truly is the honoured which is strong. But we shall go in there through despised symbols and weaknesses. They are indeed despised in comparison with the perfect glory. There is a glory that is higher than glory, there is power which is above power. Because of this the perfect things are open to us, and the hidden things of the truth; and the holy things

of the holy ones are revealed, and the bridal chamber invites us in. Insofar as it is hidden, wickedness is indeed brought to naught, but it is not taken away from the midst of the seed of the Holy Spirit; they are slaves of wickedness. But when it is revealed, then the perfect light will pour out upon every one. And all those who are in it will receive [the chrism]. Then the slaves will be free, and the captives delivered.

Schenke compares 'saying' 76, where, however, 'the holy of the holy one' appears to be identified not with the bridal chamber but with the chrism; but perhaps we should not look for complete consistency. Actually, to be precise, the literal rendering is 'the holy in the holy' (so Till), so that Grant's reference to Hebrews ix. 3 (*Vig. Chr.* 136) is not entirely valid. He is, however, right in saying that this passage 'combines motives from Matthew and Hebrews in a genuinely allegorical way': for the house left desolate (27f.) he cites Matthew xxiii. 38, for 'destroyed' Matthew xxiv. 2, for 'under the wings' Matthew xxiii. 37; the ark (34) recalls in his view Hebrews ix. 4, the reference to entering within the veil (133. 3ff.) Hebrews vi. 19–20, x. 20; finally, for the rending of the veil (5ff.) he cites Matthew xxvii. 51 and Mark xv. 38. In an earlier article he had written 'This passage is significant for Valentinian exegesis of the New Testament. It shows that these Gnostics were busy at work combining various New Testament passages, especially the more mysterious ones, in an effort to produce new mysteries and fit them into their system. It is also significant for the study of exegesis in general, for it shows the dangers of allegorization without the controls provided either by common sense or by some dogmatic system with roots on earth' (*J.B.L.* 8).

That the motives are those of Matthew and Hebrews may be admitted; but does this mean that they were derived from

these works? Apparently Grant believes they were, as with the 'synoptic' sayings in the Gospel of Thomas (cf. Grant-Freedman, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, London 1960), but this raises further questions: it would seem to imply either that the development of the Canon proceeded more rapidly in the second century than scholars have hitherto been disposed to admit (cf. van Unnik's study of the Gospel of Truth, in *The Jung Codex*, London 1955), or else that the Nag Hammadi documents are later than is commonly assumed. The problem is complicated by the fact that we have to deal with Coptic versions of (probably) Greek originals, which may have undergone modification at the translation stage, if not at other points in the course of their history. According to Doresse (198ff., 210 *et al.*), the Sophia Jesu Christi, as compared with the Epistle of Eugnostus, and the several recensions of the Apocryphon of John provide evidence of progressive redactions of the same basic documents; and these are but two examples. It would seem advisable for the moment to keep all the various possibilities open (dependence on the New Testament, some measure of independence, survival of oral tradition, etc.), instead of coming down emphatically on one side or the other. The study of these texts is still in its infancy, nor is our other evidence for the early Christian centuries so extensive as to permit of prompt and accurate assessments. These texts will require close and careful examination, detailed comparison with our other sources, rather than hasty conclusions based on the assumption that every echo indicates dependence on a source.

For the 'veil,' cf. notes on 'saying' 76 (117. 14ff.). Here it is identified with the firmament, which separates the material world from the higher realms (cf. Sophia Jesu Christi 118. 7ff. with Till's note; also Adam, *Die Psalmen des Thomas* (Beiheft 24 zur Z.N.W., Berlin 1959) 35 note 15). In a Gnostic context the God who 'controlled the creation' (διοικεῖν: 'set it in order'—Grant) might be the Demiurge (so Schenke); but the parallel in Sophia Jesu Christi suggests that here it is the

Supreme God. When the veil is rent, the 'house' is left desolate, or rather destroyed. 'The whole deity' in line 29 is, in Grant's terms, the whole (inferior) Godhead, i.e. the Demiurge and his powers. These cannot enter the Pleroma, but ascend from this world and its immediate heavens into the Ogdoad, the region vacated by Sophia on her entry into the 'bridal chamber' (cf. Iren. i. 7. 1; Grant, *Anthol.* 177). The barrier which prevents them ascending further is the Cross (Iren. i. 2. 2, 4; Grant 165f.; also Exc. 42. 1 with Casey's notes, Doresse 28 n. 73, and Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, Cambridge 1939, 155 n. 2). According to Grant (*J.B.L.* 8), Philip is apparently thinking in 34f. of the ark in Hebrews ix. 4, but 'moves imaginatively from one ark to another.' Reference may also be made to 1 Peter iii. 20 and to Apoc. Joh. 73. 5 Till (Grant 84).

Thus far the 'saying' has been dealing mainly with the destiny of the psychic. 133. 1–5 turn to the spiritual; those who belong to the tribe of the priesthood (cf. 1 *Pet.* ii. 9, *Rev.* i. 6) enter within the veil with the high priest (cf. *Heb.*). Then follows an explanation of the rending of the veil, torn from top to bottom that those below who belong above may ascend into the holy of holies. Schenke here compares 118. 1–4; for lines 12–16 cf. on 132. 14ff. above.

In the following lines the author waxes almost lyrical at the thought of the glories that are yet to be, only to return in 21f. to the realities of man's present situation. The statement that wickedness is 'brought to naught' (22: 'nothing' Schenke; 'inactive' Till) is scarcely consistent with 131. 8ff. but the meaning appears to be that in the Gnostic, who has come to recognize it for what it is, it is no longer potent. In this world the 'seed of the Holy Spirit' (Schenke compares Iren. i. 5. 6 and i. 4. 1) are still the slaves of evil (cf. 131. 25ff.), but their deliverance is assured. Cf. Rom. vi. 19f.

The addition of 'desolate' in the citation of Matthew xxiii. 38 may have its interest for the textual critic (cf. D lat Clement, noted by Grant).

133 29 (126) Every plant in
heaven my Father in heaven plants .....
pluck it out. Those who are separated will be united. [The empty]
will be filled. All who [go in]
to the bridal chamber will [beget the light]. For
they do not beget in the manner of the marriages which ....
happen in the night. The fire ....
134 in the night and is put out. But the mysteries
of this marriage are perfected in the
day and the light. That day
or its light does not set.

Schenke restores '[Every] planting in heaven my Father who is in heaven plants, [without] plucking it out (again). Those who are separated will be united. They will be filled. All who [go into] the bridal chamber will beget [the fulness]. For [they do not] beget as in the marriages which [we have before our eyes] which happen in the night. The fire [burns] in the night and is quenched.' On 29ff. he cites Iren. i. 6. 2 (Grant, *Anthol.* 175f.), the Gnostic claim to be saved by nature irrespective of conduct; but logion 40 of the Gospel of Thomas might suggest other reconstructions (for the Father's planting cf. Ign. Trall. xi). His suggestion that the separated of line 31 are the angels of the Saviour and their 'images,' the spiritual seed, is, however, highly probable. As in 130. 5ff. the 'spiritual' marriage is not a thing of darkness and the night, but of the day and of the light (as Schenke notes, the reference is to the union of the angels with the 'seed'). For the light which does not set cf. the Gospel of Truth 32. 29ff. and notes ad loc. (*Evangelium Veritatis*, Zürich 1956, 57).

134 4 (127) If anyone becomes
a son of the bridal chamber he will receive the light.
If anyone does not receive it while he is in this world, he will not
receive it in the other place. He who has received that light

will not be seen, nor can he be detained; and none shall be able to torment one of this kind even if he dwell in the world. And again when he goes out of the world he has already received the truth in the images. The world has become the aeon. For the aeon is for him a pleroma and it is in this manner: it is revealed to him alone, not hidden in the darkness and the night but hidden in a perfect day and a holy light.

The Gospel according to Philip.

The Gospel comes to an end with a final statement of the destiny of the Gnostic which touches on several of the themes already discussed. He must become 'a son of the bridal chamber' and receive the light in this life, or there is no hope for him beyond (cf. 104. 15ff., 114. 16ff., etc.). He who has received the light can neither be seen nor detained by the hostile powers (cf. 118. 5ff.). Whether he is in the world or leaves the world, none can do him harm. He has already received the truth 'in the images' (cf. 133. 12ff.), and this world has already become for him 'the other aeon.' For the Gnostic, the hopes of early Christian eschatology are already realized (cf. Grant, *Vig. Chr.* 137).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(*a*) The Gospel of Philip:

Photographic edition: *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo*, ed. Pahor Labib, Cairo 1956, pl. 99–134.

German Translation: H. M. Schenke, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1959; reprinted in Leipoldt-Schenke, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag-Hamadi*, Hamburg-Bergstedt 1960, 33–65 and 81f.

Articles:

J. B. Bauer: Zum Philippus-Evangelium Spr. 109 und 110, *Theol. Literaturzeitung* 1961, 551ff.

R. M. Grant: Two Gnostic Gospels, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960), 1–11.

—— The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip, *Vigiliae Christianae* xv (1961), 129ff.

H. C. Puech: Das Philippus-Evangelium, in Hennecke-Schneemelcher *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* i, Tübingen 1959, 194ff.

E. Segelberg: The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel according to Philip and its Sacramental System, *Numen* vii (1960), 189ff.

(*b*) Other Works:

(i) Texts:

A. Malinine, H. C. Puech, G. Quispel: *Evangelium Veritatis*, Zürich 1956.

id. and W. C. Till: *Evangelium Veritatis* (Supplementum), Zürich and Stuttgart 1961.

W. C. Till: *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis* 8502 (TU 60), Berlin 1955.

Clement of Alexandria, *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, ed. R. P. Casey (Studies and Documents i), London 1934.

—— ed. F. M. M. Sagnard (Sources chrétiennes 23), Paris 1948.

Irenaeus, *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, ed. J. A. Robinson, London 1920.

—— ed. L. M. Froidevaux (Sources chrétiennes 62), Paris 1959.

R. M. Grant: *Gnosticism. An Anthology*, London 1961.

(ii) Modern literature:

C. A. Baynes: *A Coptic Gnostic Treatise*, Cambridge 1933.
J. Daniélou: *Théologie du judéo-christianisme*, Tournai 1958.
J. Doresse: *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, London 1960.
B. Gärtner: *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas*, London 1961.
R. M. Grant: *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, New York 1959.
Hans Jonas: *The Gnostic Religion*, Boston 1958.
J. N. D. Kelly: *Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1958.
G. W. H. Lampe: *The Seal of the Spirit*, London 1951.
F. M. M. Sagnard: *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée*, Paris 1947.
R. McL. Wilson: *The Gnostic Problem*, London 1958.
—— *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, London 1960.

INDEXES TO THE GOSPEL OF PHILIP

The numbers refer to the sayings according to Schenke's division

A. Persons and Subjects

B. New Testament Echoes and Allusions

